16-4

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BR 143 .P7 1803 v.4
Priestley, Joseph, 1733-1804.
A general history of the Christian church

J. Priestley

A general church history.

V. 4

(or part II, v. 2)

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL

THE

HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

PERIOD XVIII.

FROM THE TAKING OF JERUSALEM BY THE CRUSADERS A. D. 1099 TO THE TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE BY THE LATINS A. D. 1204.

SECTION I.

The Hiſtory of the Cruſaders continued.

CONSIDERING the ſtrange irregular manner in which the firſt cruſade was conducted, it terminated much better than could have been expected. Godfrey himſelf, however, did not long ſurvive his ſucceſs. He died in A. D. 1101, and was ſucceeded by Baldwin count of Edeſſa.

The ſucceſs of this firſt expedition encouraged others to undertake a ſecond. In A. D. 1102 fifty thouſand men ſet out from Lombardy, conducted by Anſelm archbiſhop of Milan, Albert count of Bladras, Guibert count of Parma, and many other perſons of diſtinction; who, followed by a great number of Germans, traverſed Hungary, Bulgaria, and Thrace, and at Eaſter arrived at Nicomedia.

About the ſame time there ſet out from France William duke of Aquitain, Hugh ſurnamed *the Great*, count of Vermandois, brother of Philip king of France, who had left the former cruſaders at the ſiege of Antioch, and alſo Stephen count of Chartres and Blois, who had done the ſame. They were joined by Stephen count of Burgundy, and many others; who, with about thirty thouſand men, taking the ſame road thro' Hungary, &c. arrived at Conſtantinople, where they found Raimond count of Thouloufe; and taking him for their leader, came to Nice. But the emperor Alexis informing the Turks of their motions, and the cruſaders being divided, one party of them periſhed in the mountains, but ſome of them arrived at Tarſus, where Hugh the Great died.

They aſſembled again at Antioch, whence they proceeded, ſome by ſea, and ſome by land, for Jeruſalem, where they celebrated Eaſter in A. D. 1103.

D. 1103. Presently after this, joining Baldwin in a battle with the Mahometans, the greater part of them were cut off, and among them both Stephen count of Chartres and Blois, and Stephen count of Burgundy; so that this second crusade proved very unsuccessful.

This enthusiasm, however, was far from being abated in the West. Boemond prince of Antioch going to France in A. D. 1106, and being married at Chartres, harangued the principal nobility of France, who were assembled on the occasion, in such a manner as that great numbers of them took the cross. At the same time the crusade was preached with more solemnity by the pope's legate Brunon de Signi, at a council in Poitiers, where Boemond was present. He did not, however, live to see the event of this expedition; for he died in Apulia on his return to the East in A. D. 1112, and thus the emperor Alexis was delivered from a formidable enemy. For tho' both were Christians, and equally opposed by the Mahometan powers, they were far from acting in concert, or at all friends to each other.

In the mean time the affairs of the king of Jerusalem wore but an indifferent aspect. Baldwin was so poor, that to mend his fortune he concealed his marriage with a wife that he had at Edessa, and married Adelaide the widow of Roger count of

Sicily, a princeſs of great wealth and power; and this he did by the advice of Arnoul the Latin patriarch of Jeruſalem, a man of a moſt profligate character. Being at the point of death, in A. D. 1117, he diſmiſſed Adelaide, and dying the year following, he was ſucceeded by Baldwin du Bourg. The arms of the Chriſtians had, however, ſome ſucceſs in the conqueſt of Tyre in A. D. 1127; and undertaking the ſiege of Damaſcus, they ſent ſix perſons to procure ſuccours from Europe. Theſe were preſent at the council of Troyes in A. D. 1128, when the order of the *knights templars* was confirmed, and returned the year following, attended by a great number of the nobleſſe of France.

Baldwin II dying in A. D. 1131, was ſucceeded by his ſon in law Fulk count of Angers, and he by his ſon Baldwin III in A. D. 1142.

In A. D. 1145 the biſhop of Gabala came to Rome to implore ſuccour for the cruſaders, who were in conſternation for the loſs of Edeſſa, which was taken from them by Zengui in A. D. 1144, after a ſiege of two years, with a prodigious maſſacre of the inhabitants. On this occaſion pope Eugenius wrote to Lewis the king of France, exhorting him to take arms for the defence of the Chriſtians in the Eaſt, granting the ſame indulgence to thoſe who engaged in this expedition that

Urban

Urban had done before; and giving leave to engage the fiefs of the church, if the lords would not advance the money that would be wanted. Lewis had before this determined upon the expedition; and holding a parliament at Vezelai in Burgundy, at Eaſter in A. D. 1146, where he was attended by the principal biſhops and lords of France, Bernard a celebrated abbot of Clairvaux, from a ſcaffold erected for the purpoſe in the open air, harangued the audience in favour of the cruſade, with ſuch effect, that after the king had taken the croſs at this time, the croſſes they had prepared were not ſufficient to ſupply the demand for them. Bernard, therefore, cut his garment into croſſes for the purpoſe. After the king, queen Alienor took the croſs, and of the lords the principal were Alfonſo count of St. Gilles and Thouloufe, Henry ſon of Thibaut count of Blois, Gui count of Nevers, and his brother Renaud count of Tonnere, Robert count of Dreux the king's brother, and Ives count of Soiſſons. Of the prelates were Simon biſhop of Noyon, Geoffroi of Langres, and Arnoul of Liſieux.

At another aſſembly, held at Chartres, every thing was ſettled reſpecting the expedition, and Bernard was urged to accept the command. This he declined; but he not only wrote to the pope, exhorting him to employ both the ſwords of St.

Peter, the ſpiritual and temporal, on this occaſion; but he ſent circular letters to all the countries of Europe to promote the cruſade. "Is not this," ſaid he, "a precious opportunity of ſalvation, an "invention worthy of the depth of divine goodneſs; "when the Almighty deſigns to call to his ſervice "murderers, thieves, adulterers, perjured perſons, "and men loaded with all ſorts of crimes, as if "they were righteous? He is willing to be your "debtor, and to give you as a recompence for this "ſervice the pardon of your ſins, and eternal glo-"ry." * He exhorted them, however, not to moleſt the Jews. This was in conſequence of a monk named Rodolf preaching the cruſade at Cologn, and along the Rhine, and urging them to murder the Jews, as the enemies of the Chriſtian religion; and on this the Jews had actually been murdered in many cities of Gaul and Germany.

Bernard

* In his addreſs to the knights templars, he ſaid, "What is moſt wonderful is that the greater part of "thoſe who enroll themſelves in this ſacred militia were "wicked wretches, impious raviſhers, ſacrilegious "murderers, perjured perſons, and adulterers; ſo that "their converſion has two good effects, to relieve their "country, and ſuccour the holy land. It is thus that "Jeſus Chriſt revenges himſelf on his enemies, triumph-"ing over them, and making uſe of them to triumph "over others."

Bernard himſelf made a progreſs thro' Germany on purpoſe to preach the cruſade; and meeting with Rodolf, he perſuaded him to return to his monaſtery. At Spire Bernard preached before the emperor Conrad; and tho' this prince had heſitated before, Bernard ſpoke in ſo moving a manner, that, with many tears, he expreſſed his readineſs to undertake the expedition. In this all the people expreſſed the greateſt ſatisfaction, and to add to the ſolemnity, Bernard took from the altar, and delivered to the emperor, a ſtandard to carry in his hand in this war. At this time alſo Frederic, nephew of the duke of Suabia, and many other perſons of diſtinction, took the croſs. Bernard having gone over a great part of Germany, and, according to the account of his hiſtorian, having performed innumerable miracles wherever he went, returned to France, and arrived at Clairvaux in February A. D. 1147.

Preſently after Conrad held his court in Bavaria, when many biſhops took the croſs, as Henry of Ratiſbon, Otho of Friſing, and Reinbert of Paſſau, together with Henry duke of Suabia, the brother of Conrad, and many other lords. But what the hiſtorian ſays was more extraordinary, was the great number of robbers and thieves who came thither for the ſame purpoſe. But after the invitation given them by Bernard, this was a very

natural thing. Not long after this, Labeſlas, duke of Bohemia, and Bernard count of Carinthia, took the croſs. The Saxons did the ſame, not, however, to go to the Eaſt, but to make war upon the neighbouring idolatrous nations, which took place the year following.

Conrad ſet out May 29, A. D. 1147, followed by his nephew Frederic duke of Suabia, and he arrived at Conſtantinople September 8th, while other Germans who had taken the croſs, went to ſerve againſt the Saracens in Spain, and took Liſbon the 21ſt of October. Lewis took his road thro' Germany the 14th of June, while Conrad had paſſed into Aſia, with guides furniſhed him by the emperor Manuel. Theſe betrayed him; and being ſurrounded by the armies of the ſultan of Iconium, where they were almoſt famiſhed, ſcarce a tenth part of them eſcaped. Conrad himſelf made good his retreat to Nice, where he was met by Lewis. Thence he went to Conſtantinople, to paſs the winter, while Lewis advanced as far as Antioch. In the ſpring Conrad went by ſea to Acre, where the cruſaders met to concert their meaſures with the king of Jeruſalem. It was agreed to beſiege Damaſcus; but not being able to take it, Conrad returned to Germany. Lewis, however, proceeded as far as Jeruſalem, where he was at Eaſter in A. D. 1149; but after this he returned

to

to France, without having effected any thing. From this time the Mahometan princes held the Latins in great contempt, and the affairs of the latter went continually backward.

The Saxon cruſaders formed an army of ſixty thouſand men. There was alſo another of forty thouſand, and the king of Denmark marched at the head of an hundred thouſand. Theſe made an expedition againſt the Sclavi, deſtroyed part of their country, and burned ſeveral cities, eſpecially one called Malchon, near to which was a famous idol temple. But after the war had continued three months, they made a peace with them, on condition of their receiving Chriſtian baptiſm, and reſtoring the captives they had taken from the Danes. Accordingly, many of them were baptized; but, as the hiſtorian ſays, without being converted. Alſo they only reſtored ſuch of the ſlaves as were old and uſeleſs, keeping all that were ſerviceable. It ſoon appeared that theſe pretended Chriſtians were worſe than they had been before, paying no regard to the promiſes they had made at their baptiſm, and making incurſions into the territories of the Danes, as much as ever.

The ill ſucceſs of this cruſade was, as might have been expected, a great mortification to Bernard; and he was reproached as having contributed to miſlead thoſe who went on that expedition. But

he alleged in his excuſe the caſe of Moſes, who, tho' acting by the immediate order of God, did not bring the Iſraelites to the promiſed land, on account of the incredulity and rebellion of the people; and theſe cruſaders, he ſaid, were not leſs incredulous, or rebellious. He likewiſe alleged the war of the eleven tribes againſt the Benjamites, when, tho' directed by God, they were defeated twice, and yet conquered the third time. When he was aſked whether he was authorized by miracles as Moſes was, he ſaid modeſty would not ſuffer him to ſpeak on that ſubject, but he left it to others; which looks as if he really thought that he had wrought ſome miracles.

The moſt formidable enemy the cruſaders had was Saladin, a prince of great ability, courage, and magnanimity. After he had made himſelf maſter of Egypt, the affairs of the cruſaders wore every day a worſe aſpect. Their manners were extremely corrupt, and military diſcipline was neglected. Pope Alexander III, on hearing this, was much affected; and ordering his legates to preach a new cruſade, the kings of France and England both promiſed to ſend ſpeedy ſuccours. The alarm was increaſed by the arrival of Heraclius the patriarch of Jeruſalem, and others from the Eaſt, at Verona, where the pope and the emperor were holding a council in A. D. 1184, and whoſe aſ-

ſiſtance

ſiſtance they implored. Nothing was done at that time; but they were ſent with letters of recommendation to Philip Auguſtus king of France, and Henry II of England. The former would have undertaken the expedition himſelf; but having no children, he ſent ſeveral brave knights at his expence, and a great number of foot ſoldiers. Henry alſo did not go himſelf, but he gave leave to all who choſe it; and many perſons took the croſs, among whom were ſeveral biſhops, and great lords. Of the former were Baldwin archbiſhop of Canterbury, and Gautier of Rouen. Henry had before this, viz. in A. D. 1166, cauſed a collection to be made thro' all England for the ſervice of the holy land, which was continued five years.

As none of the kings of Jeruſalem diſtinguiſhed themſelves, it is barely worth while to note their ſucceſſion. Baldwin III dying in A. D. 1160, was ſucceeded by his brother Amauri, and he by his ſon Baldwin IV in A. D. 1172. This Baldwin was a leper, incapable of buſineſs, and dying in A. D. 1185, was ſucceeded by his nephew Baldwin V, then nine years old; and he dying the next year, A. D. 1187, Guy de Luſignan was made king; and he was the laſt who reigned at Jeruſalem.

The

The Templars having broken the truce that had been made with Saladin, he was reſolved on revenge; and coming with an army of fifty thouſand men, he defeated the Chriſtians in a pitched battle near Tiberias, and took the king himſelf, and all the chiefs priſoners. The king he ſpared, but he put to death Arnold de Chaſtillon, maſter of the Templars, who had been the cauſe of breaking the truce, and alſo all the knights both of the temple and thoſe of the order of John of Jeruſalem, who had never given any quarter to the Mahometans in peace or war. It was a great affliction to the Chriſtians to loſe in this battle what they took to be the true croſs of Chriſt, which they had with them as a pledge of victory. After this Saladin took almoſt all the places on the ſea coaſt, and then he took Jeruſalem itſelf by capitulation the 2d of October A. D. 1187, after it had been in the poſſeſſion of the Chriſtians eighty-eight years. The only places that were then left to them were Antioch, Tyre, and Tripoli.

The news of the loſs of Jeruſalem threw the whole Chriſtian world into the greateſt conſternation, and eſpecially pope Clement III. Being then at Piſa, he earneſtly exhorted the people aſſembled in the cathedral church to labour for the recovery of the holy land; and he gave the ſtandard of St. Peter to Ubaldi the archbiſhop of that

ſee,

ſee, with the title of legate. Accordingly he ſet out in the middle of September the ſame year A. D. 1188, with a fleet of fifty veſſels, and after wintering at Meſſina, arrived at Tyre the 16th of April the year following.

The kings of France and of England, having a conference at Giſors to ſettle their differences, at the exhortation of William archbiſhop of Tyre, who repreſented to them the deplorable ſtate of things in the Eaſt, agreed to compromiſe every thing in diſpute between them, and both of them took the croſs, together with ſeveral great lords and biſhops. The king of England, moreover, ordered every perſon in his dominions to pay a tenth of his revenues towards the expence of the expedition, and forbad all expenſive luxuries. The king of France followed his example, and this tax was called Saladin's tythe.

The croſs was alſo taken on this occaſion by Frederic the emperor of Germany, and his ſon Frederic duke of Suabia, together with no leſs than ſixty-eight great lords of Germany, both eccleſiaſtic and ſecular; and their departure was fixed for the 23d of April the year following. A difference ariſing between the emperor of Germany and Iſaac Angelus the emperor of Conſtantinople, the former took Philippopoli the 25th of April A. D. 1189, and paſſed the winter at Adrianople.

nople. The next year, at Eaſter, he paſſed the Heleſpont, and on the 18th of May took Cogni the capital of the Seljukian Turks; but he was unfortunately drowned as he was bathing in a river of Cilicia, the 10th of June. His ſon Frederic duke of Suabia took the command of the army, but died ſix months after before Acre.

King Richard ſet out from England the 10th of December A. D. 1189, and the king of France joined him the 4th of July, A. D. 1190. Separating at Lyons, Lewis embarked at Genoa, and Richard at Marſeilles; and rejoining at Meſſina, they paſſed the winter there. At the end of March the king of France left Meſſina, and on the 20th of April arrived at Acre, which the Chriſtians had been beſieging two years. Richard ſailed from Meſſina the 10th of April, and being ſhipwrecked on the iſle of Cyprus, he conquered it from Iſaac Comnenus, who had revolted from Iſaac Angelus, and arrived at Acre, which ſurrendered the 13th of July A. D. 1191, and became a place of great importance to the Latins in Paleſtine.

Soon after this event the king of France returned to his country, but Richard ſtayed, and defeated Saladin on the 27th of September. Being obliged, however, to return to England ſoon after, and the other lords not being able to continue the war,

war, he wrote the moſt preſſing letters to the pope to engage him to come in perſon to their aſſiſtance, but without effect. Richard having made a truce with Saladin for three years, left Paleſtine the 8th of October A. D. 1192, and returning thro' the dominions of the duke of Auſtria, whom he had offended at the ſiege of Acre, he was taken and impriſoned the 20th of December, and in this ſituation he continued all the year following.

On the death of Saladin in A. D. 1196, the Chriſtians thought it furniſhed a favourable opportunity to renew the war; and in Germany three great armies were formed in A. D. 1197. The firſt, commanded by Conrad archbiſhop of Mayence, went by land to Conſtantinople, and thence by ſea to Tyre. The ſecond went by ſea, and coaſting Spain took Silves in Portugal, and demoliſhed it, and thence proceeded by the ſtraits to Acre. The third army, which was the ſtrongeſt, the emperor Henry took with him to Italy, in order to complete the reduction of that country, and of Sicily, after which it was conducted by Conrad biſhop of Virſburg his chancellor, and arrived at Acre the 22d of September. But the chancellor himſelf ſtopped at the iſle of Cyprus, to crown Guy of Luſignan, who did not chuſe to receive his crown from the emperor of Conſtantinople.

These German crusaders found the truce which had been made with Saladin broken, and his brother Safodin in possession of Jaffa, which he had taken and demolished. The Christians, however, gained a battle near Sidon, and retook several of the places they had lost, tho' they did not succeed in the siege of Toron. But these Germans were exceedingly scandalized at the disorderly lives of the Francs, who being satisfied with the possession of a fertile country, minded nothing but their own interest and pleasure, without any regard for Jerusalem, or the holy sepulchre. They even suspected the Francs of acting in concert with the Mahometans for their destruction. They, therefore, separated from them, and having recovered Jaffa, returned home; and so this formidable armament ended in disappointment.

Pope Innocent III, who interested himself much in the affairs of the holy land, directed a new crusade to be published, and employed Fulk of Neuville, a popular preacher, to preach it up, and he did it with great success. In consequence of his preaching, Thibaut IV count of Champagne, Lewis count of Blois, Simon de Montfort, and several other persons of distinction took the cross, and also Baldwin IX count of Flanders, with many lords of that country. Farther to facilitate this expedition, the pope wrote to the emperor Alexis,

Alexis, begging his concurrence, tho' not without reproaching him for not having aſſiſted in the conqueſt of the holy land, and threatening him if he did not change his conduct. The emperor, however, alleged in his excuſe the ill offices that had been done him by the cruſaders.

After many conferences held by the cruſaders at Compeigne in A. D. 1200, they named ſix deputies, to whom they gave the power to direct all their proceedings, and theſe choſe Boniface II, the marquis of Montferrat, for their chief. Being aſſembled at Venice the 2d of June A. D. 1202, they were met by another body from Germany, headed by Martin Litz, abbot of a monaſtery of Ciſtercians in the dioceſe of Baſle. At the ſame time there arrived a fleet from Flanders, conducted by John de Nelli of Bruges. But many of the cruſaders not being able to raiſe the ſums which had been ſtipulated to be paid to the Venetians for their tranſportation, returned. Others, however, and among them the count of Flanders, and the marquis of Montferrat, gave the full price, tho', in order to raiſe it, they were obliged to ſell their veſſels of gold and ſilver, and alſo to raiſe as much as they were able on credit. Still, of the whole ſum that had been agreed to be paid, there remained no leſs than thirty-four thouſand marks of ſilver; and therefore as an equivalent for this, they

promiſed the doge of Venice to aſſiſt them in the taking of Zara, which had been taken from them by the king of Hungary. On hearing this, the pope was exceedingly offended, and forbad them on pain of excommunication to attack the dominions of any Chriſtian prince, and Zara by name, then in the poſſeſſion of the king of Hungary, who had himſelf taken the croſs. He particularly forbad the marquis of Montferrat to have any concern in this buſineſs, and accordingly he declined going on the expedition.

While they were preparing to embark there arrived at Venice ambaſſadors from young Alexis, ſon of the emperor Iſaac, whom his brother had dethroned; begging their aſſiſtance in his reſtoration, the prince himſelf, who had applied to the pope with the ſame requeſt, being gone to the emperor Philip of Suabia.

On the 8th of October they ſailed from Venice, and arriving before Zara the 10th of November, they took the place, and paſſed the winter there. At this place they received letters from the pope, in which he treated them as excommunicated perſons, inſiſted on their doing no farther injury to the king of Hungary, and making reſtitution for what they had done. But the principal buſineſs tranſacted now was their treaty with Alexis who met them, together with ambaſſadors from the emperor

peror Philip. He promiſed that, if they would reſtore him, he would bring the empire of Conſtantinople under obedience to the pope, indemnify them for all their expences, and would either go with them to Egypt, or ſend ten thouſand men at his expence, and always keep five hundred knights to guard the country. To this expedition many objected; but at length it was acceded to by the majority, and the pope himſelf in reality was a well wiſher to it, as promiſing a great addition to his power. And as the cruſaders made an apology to him for their conduct at Zara, he abſolved them from the excommunication he had laid them under. But the Venetians not acknowledging that they had done any thing wrong, remained unabſolved. In this place, however, the moſt conſiderable of the French lords left the army, as Simon de Montfort, and his brother Guy; Simon having made a treaty with the king of Hungary, to whom he then went, tho' afterwards he proceeded to Paleſtine.

After Eaſter the cruſaders left Zara, and notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of the pope againſt their intermeddling with the affairs of the Greeks, arrived in ſight of Conſtantinople the 23d of June, and taking it by aſſault crowned young Alexis emperor the 1ſt of Auguſt A. D. 1203; but becoming odious to the Greeks on account of his

connexion with the Latins, and his exactions in order to raiſe the money he had promiſed them, tho' it was by no means all that he had promiſed, he was put to death by another Alexis, ſurnamed Marchoufle, who got himſelf elected emperor. The cruſaders offended at this again took the city on the 12th of April, Marchoufle flying by night. Having got poſſeſſion of the city, it was abandoned to plunder, the churches themſelves, and things the moſt ſacred, not being ſpared.

In this plunder of the city the Latins found abundance of relics, which they conſidered as lawful prize. But becauſe many of the ſoldiers ſet leſs value on the relics than the rich caſes in which they were contained, and which they broke for the ſake of the materials of which they conſiſted, the chiefs began to be alarmed leſt this ſacrilege ſhould bring ſome judgment upon them; and in conſequence of this the pope's legate and the biſhops forbad all perſons under pain of excommunication, to retain relics, and directed them to be put under the cuſtody of the biſhop of Troyes.

After the taking of the city Baldwin count of Flanders was choſen emperor, and in this character he was crowned the 17th of May A. D. 1204; and the marquis Boniface was made king of Theſſalonica.

SECTION

SECTION II.

Of the Power of the Popes in this Period.

AN account has been given in a preceding period of the publication of ſpurious *decretal epiſtles* of the popes, from the earlieſt times by Iſidore of Seville. That theſe *decretals*, as they were uſually called, ſhould have been received as genuine, when ſo much depended upon them, is one of the moſt extraordinary facts in hiſtory. But they were forged and publiſhed in an age of great ignorance, when few of the laity, whoſe rights they principally affected, could even read; and tho' the clergy loſt ſomething, yet the ſacerdotal order in general gained more than it loſt, by the publication. The fact, however, is ſuch, that few perſons in that age, or ſeveral of the ſucceeding ones, appear to have entertained a doubt of the genuineneſs of theſe epiſtles; and as but little advantage was taken of them at the time, and the power of the popes and of the clergy had been increaſing from other cauſes, their authority had a better opportunity of eſtabliſhing itſelf, than if they had been appealed to and acted upon immediately.

Fleury, in one of his excellent *Diſcourſes on eccleſiaſtical hiſtory*, ſhews at large how much the

power of the popes was advanced by means of theſe decretals, eſpecially after they were included in the collection of canons, together with other ſpurious works of the Fathers, by Gratian, a Benedictine monk of the monaſtery of St. Felix in Bologna, which was for many ages the great univerſity for the ſtudy of both the canon and the civil law. This work of Gratian, was publiſhed in A. D. 1158. To the decretals Fleury aſcribes the introduction of the following important maxims and practices, viz. that no councils can be held without the authority of the pope, that biſhops cannot be judged definitively but by him, that he has the ſole right of approving the tranſlations of biſhops from one ſee to another, of erecting new biſhopricks and metropolitan churches, * and the conſequence of theſe, the frequent appeals to Rome from all parts of the Chriſtian world. In addition to theſe aroſe an opinion unheard of, as Fleury ſays, before the publication of this work of Gratian, that tho' the church of Rome gives authority to all the canons, it is not bound by them itſelf; and yet this new doctrine was generally received in the three following centuries, and the power

* At the erection of Eli in England into a biſhopric in A. D. 1107, it was thought neceſſary to get the leave of the pope.

power of the popes ſeems to have been at no period ſo fully eſtabliſhed as in this.

Paſcall II, in a letter addreſſed to the archbiſhop of Poland, maintained that the councils did not make a law for the church of Rome, ſince it was that church which gave authority to the councils. But, ſays Fleury, it is only in the ſpurious decretals that there is any foundation for this maxim. The popes, in times prior to theſe, claimed a right of giving or refuſing their ſanction to the decrees of councils, and generally ſent legates to preſide in them. Fleury ſays that from the year A. D. 1110 there were no councils in France without legates from the popes.

The maxim of the ſubjection of temporal to ſpiritual power, advanced by Gregory VII, tho' oppoſed in his time, was by no means given up, but was aſſumed as an axiom by ſucceeding popes. Innocent III, the moſt diſtinguiſhed of them in this period always reaſoned and acted upon it as far as circumſtances would permit.

It was in this period, and eſpecially in his pontificate, which began in this period, and extended into the next, that the papal power may be properly be ſaid to have been at its height. Exalted above the kings of the earth, the popes extended their power over all kingdoms, and kings thought it their greateſt honour to own themſelves

their vaſſals, and make their kingdoms tributary to the apoſtolic ſee. The popes had made themſelves ſovereigns in Rome, and diſclaimed all dependence upon the emperors. Rome was become the general court to which not only all eccleſiaſtical, but even all civil cauſes, from all parts of Europe, were carried. Appeals to Rome of all kinds, and from all perſons, were become ſo frequent, that there was no affair of any conſequence but was immediately carried thither.

The popes had for the moſt part engroſſed to themſelves the conferring of biſhopricks, becauſe they were the judges of the validity of elections, tho' theſe properly belonged to the clergy, as the ordinations did to the metropolitans. In order to ſhew their unlimited power, and make advantage of it, there was nothing that could happen for which diſpenſations could not be obtained at Rome; which ſo enervated eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, that it provoked Bernard to declaim ſo violently as he did againſt it. But what raiſed the papacy to the higheſt pennacle of glory, was that the diſputes between ſovereign princes were uſually referred to Rome. And as by this means the general government of Europe may be ſaid to have been in the hands of the popes, the interior government of all the ſeparate ſtates was chiefly, in thoſe times, and long after, intruſted to eccleſiaſtics. They

were

were employed in the greateſt offices of truſt and power, and in all the moſt important embaſſies. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 637.

In order to form a clearer idea of the ſpirit of theſe times, I ſhall recite ſome ſpecimens of the manner in which Innocent III reaſoned, and in which he was ſometimes anſwered.

Having taken the part of Otho in a conteſt for the empire of Germany, in writing to him, he ſays, "By the authority of almighty God, which has "been given to us in the perſon of St. Peter, we "receive you as king, and order that henceforth "reſpect and obedience be rendered to you as ſuch; "and after the cuſtomary preliminaries, we ſhall "give you ſolemnly the imperial crown." At the ſame time he wrote to the princes of Germany, ſpiritual and temporal, enjoining them to reſpect Otho as king of the Romans, and emperor elect; and as to any oaths they might have taken to the contrary, he promiſed to ſet their reputation and conſcience at eaſe on the ſubject.

To this the princes who had taken the part of Philip of Suabia replied in the following ſenſible and ſpirited manner, "Where have you read that "you, or your predeceſſors, or their envoys, have "interfered in an election of a king of the Romans, "either as electors, or as judges of the election? "Jeſus Chriſt has diſtinguiſhed the provinces of

" the two powers, ſo that he who is engaged in the " ſervice of God muſt not involve himſelf in tem- " poral affairs, and he who is charged with theſe " does not preſide in things ſpiritual. But ad- " mitting you to be judge, a ſentence given in the " abſence of one of the parties is null. We have " unanimouſly choſen Philip king, and require " that you crown him at a proper time and place, " as is your duty."

The pope, in a long anſwer to this remonſtrance, ſaid that the power of the princes of the empire to chuſe a king of the Romans came from the holy ſee, which transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans in the perſon of Charlemagne; and that "the princes ought to acknow- " ledge that he has a right to examine the perſon " whom they chuſe for king, ſince it is we who " conſecrate and crown him; and it is an univer- " ſal rule, that the examination of the perſon be- " longs to him who impoſes hands upon him. " If," ſaid he, "the princes ſhould chuſe a perſon " excommunicated, a heretic, or a pagan, muſt " we be obliged to crown him?" The king of France was offended at the pope's taking the part of Otho, who was his enemy, and ſent a remonſtrance on the ſubject, and afterwards the pope abandoned him.

He

He did not, however, abandon his maxims. For when he refuſed to legitimate the children of William duke of Montpelier, after he had legitimated thoſe of Philip Auguſtus, he ſaid he had a right in certain caſes to exerciſe temporal juriſdiction in other places beſide the patrimony of the church, where he had ſovereign authority, temporal and ſpiritual. To prove this, he alleged a paſſage in Deuteronomy, in which it is ſaid that, in affairs of greater difficulty, or where the opinions of the ordinary judges differed, they ſhould go to the place which God ſhould chuſe, and addreſs themſelves to the high prieſt, as ſupreme judge, and even abide by his ſentence under pain of death.

The ſame pope, giving his reaſons, A. D. 1203, for interfering to make peace between the kings of France and England, quotes, in a letter to the former, many paſſages of ſcripture, the purport of which was to ſhew that Jeſus Chriſt came to bring peace. "No perſon," he ſays, "doubts but that "he came to judge with reſpect to the ſalvation "or damnation of the ſoul; but is not ſowing diſ-"cord, attacking Chriſtians, plundering the poor, "ſpilling human blood, profaning churches, and "deſtroying monaſteries, works deſerving of eter-"nal damnation. Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *if thy brother "ſin againſt thee, reprove him.* You have been "reproved. What remains then but that, if you "will

" will not hear the church, you be treated as a " heathen man and a publican ? You will ſay you " do no wrong, and the king of England the ſame ; " muſt we not then inquire into the ſtate of the fact, " and after having found it, proceed according to " the command of God ? Shall we ceaſe to reprove " the wicked, and put a ſtop to violence ?"

Writing to the king of England, he ſays, " We do not pretend to judge concerning fiefs, " but concerning *ſin*, the correction of which with- " out doubt belongs to us, with reſpect to all per- " ſons whatever. No perſon is ignorant that it be- " longs to us to reprove all Chriſtians in caſe of " mortal ſin ; and if he deſpiſe correction, to in- " flict eccleſiaſtical cenſures. We are particularly " obliged to do ſo with reſpect to breaker of the " peace, and oaths ; ſince both theſe belong to the " judgment of the church." In this manner it was eaſy for the popes to claim juriſdiction in all caſes whatſoever.

In things of a properly ſpiritual nature, the authority of the popes was ſeldom diſputed. We ſometimes, however, meet with an inſtance of the good ſenſe of the laity revolting at the diſpenſing power of the popes in matters of plain morality. Pope Calixtus deſiring Henry I of England to allow of the election of Turſtan to the biſhoprick of York, he ſaid that he had ſworn that he would

not

not as long as he lived. To this the pontiff replied, "I am pope, and if you will comply with my re-"queſt, I will abſolve you of that oath." The king ſaid he would conſider of it, and afterwards anſwered, that it did not become his dignity to receive the abſolution that he offered. "What con-"fidence," ſaid he, "can there be in an oath if it "be ſeen by my example that they may be ſo eaſi-"ly broken?" Turſtan not yielding to the king's demands, he never ſuffered him to come into his dominions, nor would he permit the pope's legate to enter them. Neither was this king, nor the pope deficient in ſpirit, to aſſert what they ſuppoſed to be their rights. The king inſiſting on his right of granting inveſtitures, and Anſelm vigorouſly oppoſing him, the latter went to Rome, and the king ſent an ambaſſador who ſaid that his maſter would loſe his kingdom rather than relinquiſh his right. The pope replied, he would loſe his head rather than grant it. Henry, however, appears to have withſtood with great firmneſs all the pope's attempts to incroach upon his prerogatives.

In this reign the pope made great complaint of the refractorineſs of the Engliſh, that no appeals were made to Rome, that tranſlations of biſhops were made without his conſent, and that Peter pence was irregularly paid; but tho' the king was threatened with excommunication, if he continued

tinued obſtinate, he kept to his purpoſe; and in a conference which he had with pope Calixtus in A. D. 1119, the latter promiſed to allow him all the prerogatives of his anceſtors, and that he would ſend no legate to England except he deſired it, on account of any caſe that could not be decided by his own biſhops.

Other princes in this period ſhewed the ſame ſpirit, in deſpiſing the raſh and unjuſt cenſures of the popes. William king of Scotland, tho' excommunicated by Alexander III, for not ſuffering John biſhop of St. Andrews (whoſe intereſt was ſupported by the pope) to take poſſeſſion of the ſee, paid no regard to it; and on this account the kingdom was laid under an interdict in A. D. 1181. Afterwards, he applied to pope Lucius III and was abſolved. When Philip Auguſtus king of France was threatened with an excommunication by the pope's legate, he ſaid, he ſhould not regard it, becauſe it would not be juſt. Tho' Innocent III pronounced a ſentence of excommunication and depoſition againſt André king of Hungary, becauſe he did not fulfil his engagement to go to the holy land, he never paid any regard to it, and his brother, whom the pope had favoured, dying, André was univerſally received as king, and was acknowledged by the pope himſelf. Paſcal II appears to have conſidered Henry IV of Germany

as

as lawful emperor, tho' excommunicated, and depoſed by Gregory VII and his ſucceſſors. This example, ſays Fleury, and many others, ſhews that the power of the pope over the temporalities of princes was not received as an article of faith. Laſtly, pope Innocent III having ſent a legate into France, to make peace between the kings of France and England, Eudes duke of Burgundy adviſed the king of France not to make a peace or truce, by conſtraint of the pope, or of any cardinal. "If," ſaid he, "the popes do any violence "to the king on this account, I will aſſiſt him to "the utmoſt of my power, and will make no peace "with the pope, but with the king."

Complaints were frequently made of the improper and injudicious interference of the popes in the dioceſes of other biſhops. Bernard remonſtrated with great earneſtneſs with pope Eugenius on exemptions that were too eaſily granted. "Abbots," he ſaid, "are withdrawn from their obe-"dience to the biſhops, biſhops from archbiſhops, "archbiſhops from their primates. You ſhew," he ſaid, "by this the plenitude of your power; "but perhaps at the expence of juſtice. The "biſhops become more inſolent, the monks more "relaxed, and even more poor; for they are plun-"dered, and have no protection."

The

The people of Rome were not, for ſeveral centuries, reconciled to the temporal power of the popes, and often gave them much trouble on that account. In A. D. 1144 they choſe one Jourdan to be their patrician, or prince, inſiſting on pope Lucius II reſigning to him the rights of regalia, both within and without the city; maintaining that he ought to be content with the tythes and oblations, as the antient biſhops were. They applied to the emperor Conrad on the occaſion; ſaying, they were acting for his intereſt, and to reſtore the empire to what it had been in the times of Conſtantine and Juſtinian. He did not, however, think proper to pay any regard to them, but received the ambaſſadors of the pope very graciouſly. Pope Eugenius being obliged to fly from Rome upon his election in A. D. 1144, he excommunicated Jourdan and his adherents, and by the aſſiſtance of the Tiburtines compelled the Romans to ſubmit to be governed as before. Being, however, tired with their continual oppoſition, he went to France, and was received in Paris by king Lewis. In A. D. 1148 he returned to Rome.

So violent was the quarrel between Lucius III and the people of Rome, that in A. D. 1184 they ſeized many of his cardinals, and put out the eyes of them all except one, whom they ſent to him. He was alſo obliged to leave the city, and take up his

his reſidence at Verona, where he died. After a long diſſention, the people of Rome made their peace with Clement III, promiſing to ſurrender to him the ſenate, the city, and the mint, and to ſwear fealty to him annually, on condition of his ſurrendering to them the town of Tuſculum, which he did in A. D. 1188. At the acceſſion of Innocent III the Romans ſwore fealty to him, and not to the emperor, as they had been uſed to do.

What is more extraordinary is, that the popes ſeem to have derived little or no permanent advantage from the liberal donation of Matilda, tho' in A. D. 1102, ſhe renewed the gift of all her eſtates in the moſt ample manner to the church of Rome. For when ſhe died in A. D. 1116, Henry V was invited to come and take poſſeſſion of all her eſtates, no regard being paid to the donation, not even, as Fleury ſays, by pope Paſcal himſelf.

Tho' the more ſpirited of the temporal princes could, when circumſtances favoured them, ſet the popes at defiance, they were too ready, thro' their ignorance, to avail themſelves of their ſuppoſed prerogative, when they were gainers by it, without ſufficiently conſidering the conſequence of that conduct. When Henry II of England attempted the conqueſt of Ireland, he applied to pope Adrian IV for his permiſſion, and the pope in granting it

ſaid "It is not to be doubted but that Ireland, "and all the iſlands which have received the "Chriſtian faith, belong to the church of Rome," and on condition that he cauſed to be paid to St. Peter a penny per annum for every houſe, he gave his conſent for the conqueſt. The ſame prince, tho' ſufficiently high ſpirited on ſome occaſions, yet when he was preſſed by the civil wars with his ſons, applied to pope Alexander III in a manner much too abject; ſaying, "the kingdom of England is "under your juriſdiction, and as to the feudal right, "it depends upon you." Thus, at leaſt, Peter of Blois made the king ſay in a letter which he wrote for him. It is very poſſible, however, that the king might not have been acquainted with the full meaning of that language.

The power of the popes was moſt frequently diſplayed in the caſe of uncanonical marriages. In this period we have a remarkable example of it. Philip Auguſtus king of France refuſing to take his wife Ingelburga, daughter of the king of Denmark, whom he had unjuſtly divorced, Innocent III ſent his legate to admoniſh him; and this not ſucceeding, at a council held at Vienne in A. D. 1199 he laid all his dominions under an interdict, and ordered all the prelates to obſerve it under pain of ſuſpenſion. This interdict remained in force eight months, in all which time the churches were

ſhut,

ſhut, and the dead lay unburied. In conſequence of this the king was obliged to go into the territories of the king of England to get his ſon married. For ſome time the king reſented this conduct of the pope, ſo much that he expelled the biſhops from their ſees, and confiſcated their effects. Such influence had the popes mandates on the minds of the common people, and he found himſelf ſo great a ſufferer in conſequence of it, that he was obliged to yield. Tho' he was paſſionately fond of Agnes, whom he had married, and ſhe was with child, and he had an invincible averſion to Ingelburga, his nobles perſuaded him to comply with the demands of the pope, by diſmiſſing Agnes and receiving Ingelburga, as his queen, and promiſing to behave to her as ſuch.

I muſt not omit a curious circumſtance which ſhews the haughtineſs of pope Calixtus III. When he crowned the emperor Henry VI, he puſhed with his feet the imperial crown, which was placed between them, and threw it to the ground, to denote his power of depoſing the emperor; after which the cardinals took it up, and placed it on his head.

At the cloſe of this ſection, relating to the power of the popes in general, I ſhall obſerve that it is in the writings of Geoffroy of Vendome on the ſubject of inveſtitures, that we meet with the firſt mention of

the *two ſwords of St. Peter*, as ſignifying the temporal and ſpiritual power.

Tho' the papal power reſides in the perſon of the reigning pontiff, he, like other ſovereign princes, does not often chuſe to act without the concurrence of his council, which conſiſts of the cardinals. When William king of Sicily ſent to treat of peace with Adrian IV, and the pope himſelf was of opinion that the terms were ſufficiently advantageous, and would have accepted them, the greater part of the cardinals being of a different opinion, they were rejected.

SECTION III.

Of the Schiſms in this Period, and the Tranſactions between the Popes and the Emperors of Germany.

SOME account of the tranſactions between the popes and the emperors of Germany, and of the ſchiſms in the papacy, which had an intimate connection with thoſe tranſactions, is of too much conſequence to be omitted, as they help to give a juſt idea of the maxims and ſpirit of theſe times.

At the cloſe of the laſt period the ſchiſm occaſioned by the election of Guibert, under the name of

of *Clement*, ſo long favoured by Henry IV, was nearly extinct. In A. D. 1100 Clement died, and his partiſans, choſe Albert Diederic, ſurnamed *Silveſter*, in his place; and after him two others, who were all immediately ſeized and depoſed by the Catholic party; nor does it appear that Henry declared for any of them. The ſituation of this emperor was not, however, changed for the better. Paſcal II renewed the excommunication of him at a council held in Rome in A. D. 1010, and encouraged his ſon Henry V to revolt againſt him, which he did in A. D. 1105, and expelled from their ſees all the biſhops who had been in communion with his antipope, whoſe body, and thoſe of his adherents, he ordered to be taken from their graves. His father dying at this time, and being buried at Liege, even his body was taken up, as that of any other perſon in a ſtate of excommunication, and put in a ſtone coffin on the outſide of the church at Spires.

However this good ſon of the church, and unnatural one to his own father, very ſoon came to be in nearly the ſame ſituation with reſpect to the popes that his father had been. For, immediately avowing the ſame ſentiments, he marched into Italy, with a view to inſiſt upon his right to grant inveſtitures by the delivery of the ſtaff and croſſier.

At a conference at Chalons, when Paul II was preſent, the archbiſhop of Treves pleaded the cauſe of the emperor; ſaying that it had been the univerſal cuſtom in the time of their predeceſſors, holy and apoſtolical men, St. Gregory and others, that when the people had freely choſen any candidate for eccleſiaſtical preferment, the emperor had confirmed their choice by the delivery of the ring and the paſtoral ſtaff; and that when the perſon ſo approved had ſworn fealty, he received the *regalia*, or the revenue granted by the prince to the ſee. To this the archbiſhop of Mayence on the part of the pope replied, that the church, purchaſed with the blood of Chriſt, would be a ſlave, if the biſhops could not be choſen without the conſent of the temporal princes; that the ring and the ſtaff belonged to the altar, with which princes had nothing to do, and that the prelates debaſed their unction, if when, conſecrated by the body and blood of Chriſt, they ſubmitted to the hands of laymen, defiled with blood. This ſo much provoked the ambaſſadors from Germany, that they declared it was not there, but at Rome, and with their ſwords in their hands, that this queſtion ſhould be decided.

At another conference, however, between his ambaſſadors and thoſe of the pope, it was agreed that the king ſhould renounce the inveſtiture, and the pope the regalia; and thus the difference ſeemed

to

to be properly accommodated. But the prince, thinking probably that he had yielded too much, in giving up what had unqueſtionably been enjoyed by preceding emperors, inſiſted, in the very middle of the coronation ſervice, on the pope's delivering him the crown, in the ſame manner, and on the ſame terms, as it had been given to Charlemagne and his anceſtors; and as the pope did not chuſe to comply with this, the emperor ordered him to be ſeized; and while he was a priſoner he, tho' with great reluctance, conſented to reſign the inveſtitures. He alſo gave the emperor the ſtrongeſt aſſurances in writing that for the future no eccleſiaſtic ſhould be conſecrated till he had received inveſtiture in the uſual form from him.

This confeſſion of the pope gave great diſſatisfaction to the ſuperior clergy; and the cardinals being aſſembled on the occaſion, they made a decree againſt the pope, and his bull. In conſequence of this the pope, when he was informed of it, promiſed to correct what he had done only by force; and at a numerous council held at Rome in A. D. 1112, he publickly revoked his conceſſion. After this, in a council held at Vienne, decrees were made againſt the right of the laity to grant inveſtitures, and Henry was excommunicated for his treatment of the pope, who confirmed theſe decrees.

Several of the clergy wrote on this occaſion; but none of them with ſo much ſpirit as Geoffroy, abbot of Vendome. He maintained that the pope ought to have died rather than have made the conceſſion that he had done. "A paſtor of bad morals," he ſaid, "may be tolerated, but not if he "err in the faith. In this caſe the faithful have a "right to oppoſe him, more than if he were a pub-"lic ſinner, and the moſt infamous perſon." For he maintained that, according to the tradition of the Fathers, the authorizing of giving inveſtiture by laymen was a hereſy.

If excommunication had any viſible effect, it muſt have been ſeen on this occaſion. Henry was excommunicated again at a council held at Beauvais in A. D. 1114, again at Rheims in A. D. 1115, at two councils held by the legate Conon, one at Cologn, and the other at Soiſſons the ſame year, and again at Cologn in A. D. 1116. Albert archbiſhop af Mayence, who had been among the firſt to encourage Henry in his oppoſition to the pope, finding that he had been excommunicated in ſo many places, and that the pope (tho', to keep his word, he had not himſelf excommunicated him) would not abſolve him, turned againſt his maſter, who was not, however, diſcouraged by this circumſtance; for he cauſed him to be apprehended, and kept him three years a cloſe priſoner.

On

On the death of Paſcal who had been driven from Rome in a faction of the citizens, ſupported by Henry in A. D. 1118, when Gelaſius was choſen to ſucceed him, Henry, not being able to bring him to an accommodation, did not conſent to his election, but favoured that of Maurice Bourdin biſhop of Bruges, who had crowned him in the abſence of the pope, and for which he had been excommunicated by Paſcal, and he aſſumed the name of Gregory VIII. On this Gelaſius excommunicated both Henry and him. This ſchiſm was not, however, of long continuance. For, on the return of Celeſtine II from France in A. D. 1120, Gregory fled to Sutri, and ſhut himſelf up in a fortreſs; but being delivered up on the approach of the army of Celeſtine, he was expoſed to inſult, and confined in a monaſtery for life.

In A. D. 1118 Conon, the pope's legate, again excommunicated Henry at a council held at Cologn, and alſo at Friſlar, at which he was much enraged, but promiſed to attend a meeting for promoting peace at Fribur. A conference was alſo agreed on between the pope and the emperor at a great council held at Rheims in A. D. 1119, at which the pope attended; but nothing coming of it, he was there excommunicated, as well as the antipope. This Conon going into the Eaſt, alſo excommunicated Henry at Jeruſalem, as he had

done on his way thither, in Greece, in Hungary, Saxony, Lorraine, and France, and required that what he had done ſhould be confirmed by the council at Lateran held by Paſcal in A. D. 1116; and tho' ſome oppoſed it, the majority conſented; and the prohibition of inveſtitures pronounced by Gregory VII was renewed.

At length, however, this great buſineſs was finally ſettled at Worms in A. D. 1122, when it was agreed between Henry and Calixtus II, that the emperor ſhould no longer give inveſtiture by the delivery of the croſs and the ſtaff, that the election of biſhops and abbots ſhould be in the king's preſence, but without violence, or ſimony; that if there ſhould be any difference, it ſhould be decided by the metropolitan and the biſhops of the province, and that the perſon elected ſhould receive the regalia by the emperor's delivering to him a ſceptre, as a badge of temporal and ſpiritual power. The aſſembly in which this was tranſacted was held in the open air, in a plain near Rheims, on account of the great multitude that attended. After this the emperor received the communion, and was reconciled to the church.

A compromiſe ſimilar to this was made in England. For at a council held in London in A. D. 1107, it was agreed that the king ſhould not give inveſtiture by the delivery of the ring and paſtoral ſtaff,

ſtaff, but that the biſhops ſhould ſwear allegiance to him. But the king, jealous of his prerogative, hearing that the emperor of Germany granted inveſtitures in the uſual form, declared that he would do the ſame if the emperor was ſuffered to do ſo.

A ſchiſm of longer continuance took place on the death of Honorius II in A. D. 1130. Before this event it had been agreed among the cardinals to make the election of the new pope in the church of St. Marc, where they ſhould all meet according to cuſtom. But thoſe cardinals who had been the particular friends of Honorius, and the greater number, apprehending a tumult, haſtened the election before the pope's death was generally known, and choſe Gregory, the cardinal of St. Ange, ſurnamed Innocent II; while the other cardinals, meeting at St. Marc's at the time appointed, choſe Peter de Leon, cardinal of St. Mary, called Anaclet II. But the party of Innocent being weaker in the city, he left Rome, and went to Piſa, in order to proceed to France.

Anaclet was acknowledged by Roger king of Sicily, but not by any of the princes in the weſtern part of Europe. There the intereſt of Innocent, which at firſt ſeemed very unpromiſing, prevailed, in conſequence of his being warmly ſupported firſt by Hugh biſhop of Grenoble, a prelate highly reſpected, and then near eighty years old, who excom-

communicated Anaclet and his adherents; and alſo by St. Bernard, who for a great part of his life almoſt governed the church. At a council aſſembled at Eſtampes for the purpoſe of deciding between the two competitors, Bernard pleaded ſo ſtrenuouſly for Innocent, that, with the exception of the duke of Aquitain, he was univerſally acknowledged in France. His popularity had alſo been greatly promoted by the ſplendid reception he had met with at the monaſtery of Clugny. After this he was acknowledged in England, Scotland, Germany, and Spain, and alſo by the king of Jeruſalem.

In A. D. 1133 Innocent, accompanied by the emperor Lothaire, went to Italy, and, they entered Rome together, the Genoeſe having aſſiſted them with a fleet; but they could not take the caſtle of St. Angelo, whither Anaclet had retired. Lothaire, however, being unable to contend with the king of Sicily, returned to Germany, and Innocent to Piſa; where, holding a grand council in which every thing was carried by the authority of Bernard, he excommunicated Anaclet and all his adherents. In A. D. 1135 Bernard ſucceeded in gaining the duke of Aquitain to acknowledge Innocent, having at the time of communion advanced towards him from the altar with the hoſt in his hand, and with furious looks threatened him with divine judgment for ſupporting the ſchiſm.

In

In A. D. 1137 Innocent, accompanied by Lothaire, again entered Rome, and even took poſſeſſion of the greateſt part of the South of Italy, which thereby returned to his obedience. But Lothaire returning to Germany, and dying there, Roger retook all that he had loſt, and obliged the country to acknowledge Anaclet. He dying in A. D. 1138, Gregory, a cardinal prieſt, ſurnamed *Victor*, was choſen to ſucceed him, but, at the perſuaſion of Bernard, he reſigned, after holding the papacy only two months; and thus this ſchiſm terminated.

The emperor Frederic Barbaroſſa, who ſucceeded Conrad in A. D. 1152, had as ſerious a difference with the popes as his predeceſſors Henry IV, or Henry V, and promoted another ſchiſm in the church of Rome. He ſhewed ſome proper ſpirit at the time of his coronation, by refuſing for ſome time to hold the pope's ſtirrup, which was inſiſted upon by Adrian IV, who was not ſatisfied with his kiſſing his foot. At length, however, he thought proper to comply with that humiliating ceremony.

This pope, having in A. D. 1157 ſent legates to complain to the emperor of the archbiſhop of Lunden being ſeized in Germany on his return from Rome, and kept a priſoner by ſome of the lords, they reproached him in an improper manner

ner for his arrogance; and in admoniſhing him to do his duty, they reminded him of his having received the imperial crown from the pope. This language gave great offence both to the emperor and his lords, who ſaid that he had received his crown from God, and not from the pope; that, of the two ſwords, he held one, and the pope the other, but both from the ſame authority. The emperor alſo expreſſed his reſentment on account of a picture exhibited at the palace of Lateran in Rome, in which Lothaire was not only repreſented as receiving his crown from the pope, but with an inſcription on it, ſignifying that he received it as a vaſſal of the pope, the term *beneficium* (or *fief*) being uſed on the occaſion. At Rome itſelf there was a party, even of the clergy, who favoured the emperor. In Germany the clergy univerſally took his part, and on his marching into Italy the pope thought proper to ſend legates to meet him, and by declaring that by the term *beneficium* was meant ſimply a *favour*, and not a *fief*, in the legal ſenſe of the term, the difference was for that time compromiſed.

The reconciliation was, however, by no means cordial. The pope, diſſatisfied with the conduct of his legates, and with the vigour with which the emperor exacted his rights of forage, &c. wrote him a letter, reſpectful enough in words, but in reality

reality diſcovering much reſentment on the occaſion. He alſo ſent it by an ordinary perſon, who diſappeared as ſoon as he had delivered it. The emperor being highly exaſperated at this, directed his ſecretary to write to the pope in the ſtyle of the antient Roman emperors, putting his own name before that of the pope, and uſing the ſingular number *thou* inſtead of the plural, which was then grown cuſtomary. In reply, the pope complained of this want of reſpect, and threatened him with the loſs of his crown if he did not act with more diſcretion.

The emperor, more irritated than before, ſaid he owed his crown to God, and that the popes held all their poſſeſſions of the emperors; that he had excluded his cardinal legates from Germany, which was one principal ſubject of the pope's complaint, becauſe inſtead of coming to preach the goſpel, and make peace, they had amaſſed gold and ſilver with inſatiable avidity, and that pride had got even into the chair of St. Peter. The emperor being at Bologna in A. D. 1159, the pope ſent four legates to him to make various complaints and demands, to which he anſwered with others, each inſiſting on their reſpective prerogatives; when the pope died in September of that year.

On the death of Adrian IV a great majority of the cardinals choſe cardinal Roland, chancellor

of

of the Roman church, by the name of Alexander III, while the reſt choſe Octavian by the name of Victor III. Alexander and his friends apprehending violence, retired to the fortreſs, but they were defended by the people of Rome, while the emperor adhered to Victor. In this ſtate of things the emperor ſummoned a council to meet at Pavia, in order to decide between the two competitors in February A. D. 1159. It conſiſted of fifty biſhops and archbiſhops, and a great number of abbots and other eccleſiaſtics. There were alſo deputies from France, England, and other countries, who promiſed to be determined by the decrees of this council. After ſeven days the deciſion was in favour of Victor, who being preſent was immediately received as pope.

On the other hand, Alexander, after admoniſhing the emperor, formally excommunicated him at Anagni on the 24th of March A. D. 1160, and declared all who had taken the oaths to him abſolved. Both Henry II of England, and the king of France, after holding aſſemblies of their reſpective clergy, acknowledged Alexander, as did the king of Jeruſalem: and it is remarkable that, in a letter addreſſed to him from a council which met at Nazareth, he was called their ſpiritual and temporal lord, tho' the king himſelf was preſent.

In

In the mean time Victor held a council at Lodi, when the emperor and many bishops were present, and there he excommunicated all who opposed him. In A. D. 1161 Alexander returned to Rome; but not being able to remain there, on account of the number of his enemies, he went to Campania, under the protection of the king of Sicily, and thence, by way of Genoa, to France, where he arrived in the beginning of the year A. D. 1162; and after holding a grand council at Tours, he took up his residence at Sens, and continued there two years.

In A. D. 1164 Victor died, and his adherents having chosen Gui of Crema, called Pascal III, the emperor confirmed his election. In A. D. 1165 Alexander left France; and having gone to Messina, where he was received with great honour by the king of Sicily, he arrived at Rome in November. But the emperor coming to Rome in A. D. 1167, and defeating the Romans, he went to Beneventum, while Pascal celebrated mass at Rome, and crowned the emperor. Sickness seizing the emperor's army, and he leaving Rome in consequence of it, Alexander pronounced against him a sentence of excommunication and deposition, using the form that was first adopted by Gregory VII, viz. that "for the future he should have no force in "battle, and gain no victory over any Christians."

In A. D. 1168 Paſcal died, and John, abbot of Strum, and biſhop of Albani, ſucceeded him, under the name of Calixtus III. But the emperor, being defeated in Lombardy in A. D. 1176, ſent to treat with Alexander, promiſing to give him the prefecture of Rome, and the lands of Matilda; and when they had a meeting at Venice, a peace was concluded between them, when Frederic, renouncing the cauſe of the antipope, was abſolved from his excommunication. On this occaſion the emperor walked before the pope, diſcharging the office of an huiſſier, and when he mounted his horſe he held his ſtirrup a long time. It is obſervable, Fleury ſays, that on this occaſion the abſolution given to the emperor related wholly to the ſchiſm, and no mention was made of the ſentence of depoſition, which had produced no effect; ſo little were the novel pretenſions of Gregory VII regarded.

At the earneſt invitation of the ſenate and people of Rome, Alexander returned thither in A. D. 1178; they promiſing to do him homage, and reſtore to him all the rights of regalia; and he made ſuch a triumphant entry as no pope had ever made before. Calixtus himſelf made a public confeſſion of his offence, and received abſolution. The ſchiſm was not, however, abſolutely ended. For a few of the friends of Calixtus choſe Lando Steno,

Steno, of the family of the Frangipani (which had always been particularly hoſtile to Alexander) and called him Innocent III, and for ſome time, a brother of Octavian, or Victor III, took him under his protection, in a fortreſs which he had near Rome.

At a general council held immediately after this ſchiſm in A. D. 1179, in order to prevent others, it was ordered that every pope ſhould have two thirds of the votes of the cardinals; and that whoever ſhould aſſume the dignity without it ſhould be deprived of all holy orders, and be excommunicated, as well as all who ſhould acknowledge him. In A. D. 1180 Alexander, having purchaſed the caſtle in which the antipope had taken refuge, he was by him put in priſon; and thus a final end was put to this long ſchiſm. After the death of Alexander the cardinals began to conform to this decree, and all other perſons, clergy or laity, were excluded from having any thing to do in the election.

SECTION IV.

Of the State of the Clergy in this Period.

IN every period of this hiſtory we find the pretenſions and power of the clergy in general to keep pace with thoſe of the popes, and indeed the principles of which they availed themſelves were, in many reſpects, common to both, eſpecially that of the ſuperiority of things ſpiritual to things temporal, and conſequently, as they ſaid, the ſuperiority of power and juriſdiction in the former with reſpect to that in the latter.

Several new maxims, with reſpect to the power of the clergy were introduced by *Gratian's Collection of canons* in this period, eſpecially that, in all caſes, they were exempted from the juriſdiction of laymen; and it was ſupported by the ſpurious decretals. On this maxim was founded the conduct of Thomas Becket.

The clergy in this period even maintained that temporal power originated from them. John of Saliſbury ſaid, "the prince receives the ſword from "the hands of the prieſt, and is the miniſter of the "prieſthood, for the exerciſe of that part of his "power, which is unworthy of his own hands." Hence he concluded that the prince is, with reſpect

to

to dignity, inferior to the prieſt, and alſo that the prieſt can take from the prince the power that he has given him. We ſee in this, ſays Fleury, the progreſs which the new maxims of Gregory VII had made after his death. Vol. 15. p. 62.

An argument uſed by Innocent III, inferior to no pontiff in this period with reſpect to ability, is truly curious. In a correſpondence with the Greek emperor Alexis, and the patriarch of Conſtantinople, who maintained that the civil power was above the ſpiritual; and who had urged that the ſword was given to the king to puniſh evil doers of all kinds, ſaid, "it was only given him "with reſpect to thoſe who made uſe of ſwords, as "the laity, but not thoſe who did not make uſe of "ſwords, as the clergy. The ſpiritual power," he ſaid, "is as much ſuperior to the temporal, as "the ſoul is ſuperior to the body." He alſo alleged what is ſaid in Jeremiah, *I have ſet thee over the nations, to pluck up and to plant*, &c. and that God had placed two great lights in the heavens, the ſun to repreſent the pontifical power, and the moon the civil. It is almoſt equally extraordinary that ſuch arguments as theſe ſhould be advanced by men of ſenſe among the clergy, or make any impreſſion on men of ſpirit among the laity.

The right of the laity to have a voice in the choice of their ſpiritual guides was for many cen-

turies uncontested; but as, at length, the cardinals usurped the sole right of chusing the popes, the canons of cathedral churches got the sole right of chusing the bishops. But this was not effected, tho' it was attempted, in this period. For at a council of Lateran in A. D. 1139, the canons were forbidden to exclude other religious persons from the election of bishops. It seems, therefore, that they had endeavoured to exclude not only the laity, but even the clergy too.

As the clergy had assumed the right of judging not only their own order, but in all cases that bore any relation to *religion*, as of marriage, &c. so they claimed to judge in all cases relating to the *crusades*, which was a war of religion.

Several of the prerogatives of the popes were assumed by the greater prelates of several Christian countries. When Sanches II king of Spain made an expedition in defence of Calatrava, John archbishop of Toledo published an indulgence, and pardon of all sins, to those who went; which, says Fleury, is the first example of a plenary indulgence being given by any besides the pope.

The excommunication of princes was not the peculiar privilege of the popes. In the case of Philip Augustus it was performed by his own subjects. Persisting in his refusal to dismiss his wife Bertrade he was excommunicated at a council held

at

at Poitiers in A. D. 1100. This and the former excommunications had such an effect, that when he and the queen went to Sens, no church in the place was opened to them. At length he was absolved by pope Pascal, on condition that he would renounce all criminal connexion with Bertrade; and at a council held at Paris in A. D. 1104 he received absolution, walking into the assembly barefooted, and with every mark of humility he took the oath required of him.

As both bishopricks and monasteries had often been given to laymen, of which we have seen many instances in preceding periods, so many of them became possessed of the right of tythes. These were called *lay impropriations*, and of course very offensive to the clergy. At a council of Lateran in A. D. 1139, which was attended by more than a thousand bishops, laymen were forbidden to possess tythes, and ordered to restore them to the church, if they would not risque the crime of sacrilege, and the peril of eternal damnation. At another council of Lateran in A. D. 1179, all laymen were forbidden to transfer to other laymen the tythes of which they should be possessed. But on this it was afterwards judged, says Fleury, that tythes possessed by laymen before this council were held legally.

The clergy in this period by no means thought or acted alike on the subject of investitures, some of them pleading the right of the princes from whom they received their preferments, and others contending for the privileges of their order in opposition to them. Of this spirit we have several remarkable instances.

Otho being invested with the bishoprick of Bamberg by Henry IV in A. D. 1103 resigned, and was reinvested by the pope, which gave him great pleasure, as but few of the bishops in Germany at that time conformed to the papal decrees on the subject. Eadmer bishop of St. Andrews in A. D. 1120 was not required to receive investiture by king Alexander's delivering to him the cross, but only the ring, and the cross he took from the altar, to denote his receiving it from God. Accordingly, when he resigned his preferment, he gave the ring to the king, but put the cross on the altar.

The greater part of the history of Anselm falls within the preceding period. He retained his firmness to the last, refusing on his return to England in A. D. 1100, in the reign of Henry, to receive the investiture of the archbishoprick of Canterbury from him. Being at Lyons he wrote to the king to inform him that he could not render him homage for his bishoprick, or communicate with

with any of thoſe to whom he had given inveſtiture. On this the king ſeized his revenues, and told him that he ſhould not return unleſs he would allow him his antient privileges; and having levied a tax on the prieſts, on the pretence of executing the decrees of a council held at London, obliging them to continence, he wrote to him a letter of remonſtrance on the ſubject, in which he ſaid "it "was a thing unheard of that a prince ſhould exe- "cute the laws of the church againſt eccleſiaſtics "by temporal puniſhments. It is the province of "the biſhops to puniſh their crimes." At length, by the advice of the pope, ſome conceſſions were made on both ſides, and Anſelm was allowed to return, and end his days in his own country.

In this period we firſt read of ſeveral abuſes, which in later times were the ſubject of great complaint with reſpect to the clergy. It was not till this time that we find any mention made of *mercenary prieſts*, or prieſts not properly belonging to any particular church, doing the duty of it for hire. This practice was forbidden at a council held at Rheims, when each church was required to have its proper prieſts, who could not be diſplaced but by the canonical judgment of the biſhop, or the archdeacon. This abuſe aroſe from biſhops ordaining prieſts without any particular title, which the biſhops were often induced to do for money,

the perſon receiving holy orders acquiring thereby valuable privileges, eſpecially an exemption from being tried in the civil courts. But at a council of Lateran in A. D. 1179 it was ordered that every biſhop who ordained any perſon without a title ſhould give him a ſufficient ſubſiſtence till he was provided with a living, unleſs he could ſubſiſt without it from his own eſtate.

In A. D. 1159 we find the firſt example of papal diſpenſations for nonreſidence and pluralities of benefices, and of recommendations or mandates, to engage the ordinary to promiſe benefices before they were vacant. Hugh de Champfleuri, chancellor of the king of France, having taken much pains to promote a reconciliation between that king and the king of England, the pope expreſſed great ſatisfaction in his conduct; and as he was a canon both of Paris and Orleans, the pope deſired both the chapters to preſerve his revenues wherever he ſhould be. He alſo deſired the biſhop of Paris to give him the firſt dignity that ſhould be vacant in his dioceſe; and he deſired the canons of that church to give him the firſt dignity at their diſpoſal, and the firſt houſe in their cloiſters that ſhould be vacant. He alſo confirmed to him the poſſeſſion of the archdeacony of Arras, given him by biſhop Godfrey; and becauſe the biſhop had made him ſwear when he gave him this, that he would reſign the

the chancellorſhip, the pope ordered the reſtitution, and abſolved him from his oath. This Hugh was made biſhop of Soiſſons in A. D. 1159, and ſtill continued chancellor of France. Pluralities, however, becoming very frequent, they were forbidden at the council of Lateran in A. D. 1179. At that time ſeveral perſons had no leſs than ſix livings, beſides ſeveral cures; ſo that they could not reſide, while many others of the clergy were deſtitute of a ſubſiſtence. At the ſame council it was forbidden to promiſe any benefice before it became vacant.

While ſo many of the clergy lived in indolence and luxury, it was found to be impoſſible to enforce the laws of celibacy and contenance. In all Normandy the prieſts were publicly married, ſwearing in the preſence of the relations of the women they married, that they would never leave them. They alſo bequeathed their churches to their ſons, as by hereditary right, and often gave them in portions to their daughters. Bernard, and ſome other monks, preaching againſt theſe practices in this country, were in danger of their lives. The church of Armagh in Ireland before the year A. D. 1133 had gone in ſucceſſion, and been confined to one family, ſome of whom had been laymen, and married. Eight of them had been of this deſcription, tho' they were not illiterate. At a council held in London in A. D. 1107,

1107, Anſelm, with the pope's conſent, allowed the advancing to holy orders the children of prieſts, on account of the great number of ſuch perſons in that country. He was alſo allowed to grant other diſpenſations, which the barbariſm of the country was thought to require.

There are many inſtances in this period, tho' not ſo many as in the preceding, of open violence committed both by the clergy and upon them. In A. D. 1112 Gandri biſhop of Laon made himſelf odious by inſtigating his brother to murder Gerard of Creci, one of the chief lords of the city, as he was at prayers in the church, which was a great aggravation of the crime. The chief cauſe of the biſhop's hatred of him was his having ſworn to the commune of that city after he had aboliſhed it. Theſe *communes* were ſocieties of burghers, who purchaſed privileges of their lords, whether laity or clergy, and often to their prejudice. On this they refuſed to pay the antient claims, and thus became odious to the clergy. This commune of Laon is the firſt that is mentioned in hiſtory. In England they were called *corporations*, and were the germs of liberty in that country. This biſhop Gaudri was afterwards murdered by the burgeſſes, for having given the king a ſum of money to prevent his confirming their privileges, and then taxing them to the amount of what they had offered

the

the king for confirming them. The archbiſhop of Mayence was murdered by his own clergy in A. D. 1160.

Some of the clergy ſtill continued to appear in arms. The biſhop of Beauvais being taken priſoner in the war with Richard king of England in A. D. 1197, the pope interceded in his favour, tho' he blamed him for wearing armour. In anſwer the king ſent the pope the ſuit of armour in which the biſhop had been taken, and aſked whether that was his brother's coat, or not.

The greateſt act of violence on the clergy that we meet with in this period was on the return of the prelates from a council at Piſa in A. D. 1134. While they were in the territory of Tuſcany, they were attacked, and much abuſed, by a company of banditti. They conſiſted of archbiſhops, biſhops, archdeacons, abbots, and monks; and yet they were plundered, ſome taken, and confined in the neighbouring caſtles. The archbiſhop of Rheims, after being inſulted and wounded, without any reſpect to his age or dignity, was put in priſon; the biſhop of Peregeux was treated in the ſame manner: the archbiſhops of Burges and Sens, after having loſt all they had about them, arrived with great difficulty at Pontremoli, and there were ſeized a ſecond time, together with the archbiſhop of Einbrun. The biſhop of Troyes was wounded with

with a lance which threw him from his horſe, and the city of Pontremoli was full of priſoners.

In the Eaſt, as well as in Europe, it had been the cuſtom to plunder the epiſcopal houſes during a vacancy of the ſees. By a conſtitution of the emperor John Comnenus, governors of provinces were forbidden to do this in the ſtrongeſt terms; and yet we find that Manuel Comnenus had occaſion to to renew this prohibition.

In ſome reſpects it was better for the world that the characters both of the popes and of the clergy in general were not more reſpectable than they were in this ignorant and ſuperſtitious age; for then their authority would have been unbounded. This appeared by the conduct of Hugh biſhop of Lincoln in the time of Henry II of England. He was a man univerſally reverenced for his integrity and ſanctity; and having behaved with uncommon fortitude and freedom in reproving this high ſpirited prince, after he had been threatened by him, he turned to his courtiers, and ſaid, "If all "biſhops were ſuch men as this, kings and lords "would have no power over them."

In this period, in which the power and influence of the clergy were at their heighth, ſomething was done which tended to check their exorbitant wealth by which their power was ſupported. For, with this view the emperor Frederick made a law

to

to prevent the transfering of fiefs without the consent of the ſuperior lords in whoſe names they were held; ſo that the giving of eſtates to the church did not depend on the ſole will of the poſſeſſor, of whom an unfair advantage was often, no doubt, taken in his dying moments. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 395.

It was in the 12th century that *ſubdeacons* were conſidered as a ſacred order in the church. Before this the three ſuperior orders were deemed to be biſhops, prieſts and deacons. But the Romiſh church now began to uſe a different language, and to ſay they were prieſts, deacons, and ſubdeacons. From this æra ſubdeacons were not allowed to return to ſecular life, any more than the clergy of the other orders. *Bingham*, Vol. 1, p. 108.

SECTION V.

The Hiſtory of Thomas Becket, Archbiſhop of Canterbury.

IN order to ſhew in a clearer light the ſpirit of the high clergy in this period, in which it was at its greateſt height, I ſhall give an outline of the hiſtory of Thomas Becket, a man of great ability

ability and ſpirit, who had thoroughly imbibed the new maxims of Gregory VII, and acted upon them, I am inclined, to think conſcientiouſly; tho' pride, and other improper diſpoſitions of mind, have more influence on men's conduct than they are themſelves aware of, as it might be in this caſe.

Becket was in the higheſt degree of favour with Henry II, and his chancellor; when, having been archdeacon of Canterbury, he was perſuaded by the king himſelf to accept of the arch-biſhopric, in A. D. 1162; and preſently after, as if he was become quite another man, he laid aſide the manners of a courtier, and aſſumed thoſe of the moſt rigid eccleſiaſtic, even wearing coarſe hair cloth next his ſkin, when he had a dreſs ſuiting his high ſtation over it. Contrary to the kings expectation and wiſhes, he reſigned the ſeals of his civil office, and devoted himſelf wholy to the duties of his clerical capacity, which not having been conſidered as incompatible with the other, diſpleaſed the king. But their firſt open difference was occaſioned by the arch-biſhop's ordering ſome clergymen convicted of crimes to be puniſhed without delivering them up to the ſecular power.

After this the king, having aſſembled the biſhops of his kingdom at London in A. D. 1163, aſked them whether they would conform to the antient

antient cuſtom of the realm. They replied, that they would *ſaving their order*. The king not liking this anſwer, required them to make the promiſe without reſtriction. The biſhop of Chicheſter replied that he would, and with good faith. But the archbiſhop, and the reſt, ſaid that, when they ſwore fealty to him, they only promiſed to preſerve his life, limbs, and temporal dignity, *ſaving their order*, and they would abide by that form. Provoked at this, the king left them abruptly, and the day after he took from the archbiſhop all the places and fiefs which he had held as chancellor.

Many of the biſhops, however, were afterwards prevailed upon to accede to the king's propoſal, and even the archbiſhop himſelf went to him, when he was at Oxford, and promiſed to change the form which had given him ſo much offence. But the king, requiring a more public ſatisfaction, called an aſſembly in A. D. 1164 at Clarendon, and then, tho' not till much urged by the other biſhops, and others who wiſhed the peace of the kingdom, he did promiſe to conform to all the antient cuſtoms without exception. On this ſome of the lords being appointed to reduce theſe cuſtoms to writing, the archbiſhop deſired ſome time to conſider them. The next day the writing was completed, and the articles amounted to ſixteen. Having taken ſome time to conſider them, and to re-

fleet upon the ſubject, the archbiſhop repented of having complied ſo far as he had done; and to puniſh himſelf, he refrained from all ſervice at the altar, and to make his ſentiments more public, he ſent to the pope, who was then at Sens in France, to obtain abſolution. Accordingly thepope ſent his abſolution, commanding him to reſume his functions, and do his duty with courage, as a good paſtor.

This conduct of the archbiſhop, which amounted to an open declaration of war againſt the king, provoked him in the higheſt degree; and to ſhew his reſentment, he did him every ill office in his power. The archbiſhop then endeavoured to go privately out of the kingdom to the pope, but was prevented by contrary winds. This attempt being a violation of an eſtabliſhed cuſtom, offended the king ſtill more; ſo that the archbiſhop, dreading his reſentment, ſeemed deſirous of obliging him by ſending to the pope to obtain his leave to conform to the cuſtoms. This, however, the pope refuſed to do. He, moreover, wrote to the king, to perſuade him to abandon cuſtoms which were contrary to the liberties of the church, out of regard to the judgments of God, who had often puniſhed kings for infringing on the privileges of the prieſthood. Notwithſtanding this, the king perſiſted in having the clergy when accuſed of theft, and other offences

offences of a civil nature, tried by the ſecular judges, while the archbiſhop conſtantly remonſtrated againſt it; maintaining that every offence of a clergyman ought to be judged in the eccleſiaſtical courts, tho' in this caſe all they had to fear was depoſition; and then, not being liable to be tried for the ſame offence in any other court, they eſcaped without any proper puniſhment.

In October A. D. 1164, the king called a council at Northampton, which was attended by all the lords and prelates of the kingdom, when the archbiſhop, for not appearing in perſon to a former citation, was condemned to have his goods confiſcated. On being informed of this ſentence, he ſaid, it had never been heard of before that an archbiſhop of Canterbury had been judged in the court of the king of England on any account whatever, ſince he was the ſpiritual father of the king, and of all the kingdom. The king then demanding of him an account of the revenues of ſeveral biſhopricks and abbeys of which he had the diſpoſal when he was chancellor, he deſired to take the advice of his friends, and they were of different opinions: The lords ſpiritual and temporal being required to give their judgment, the biſhops deliberated by themſelves; and in order to free themſelves from all blame, agreed to cite the archbiſhop before the pope, as guilty of perjury for refuſing to

obey the king, after he had taken an oath to do it; thinking by this means to procure his depoſition. But the temporal lords paſſed ſentence upon him, both as a perjured perſon, and a traitor. When this ſentence was announced to him, he ſaid after giving an account of the manner of his exaltation to the ſee of Canterbury, "as much as the ſoul is "of more value than the body, ſo much ought you "to obey God and me rather than an earthly king. "Neither the law nor reaſon permits children to "judge their father. I therefore decline your juriſ-"diction, to be judged by God alone, by the mi-"niſtery of the pope, to whom I oppeal." However, dreading the king's violence, he withdrew privately into France, landing at Bulloigne the 8th of November, A. D. 1164.

In the mean time, a deputation of biſhops and nobles was ſent by the king to the pope; but he, having been prepoſſeſſed in favour of the prelate, ſaid he could give no opinion in his abſence, and the deputies, not chuſing to wait for him, returned, after which the pope reſcinded the ſentence paſſed againſt him at Northampton.

Becket was well received by the king of France, who was not ſorry to have that opportunity of mortifying the king of England, tho' they ought to have made a common cauſe, in oppoſing the incroachments of the clergy; and being conducted

in

in the moſt reſpectful manner by the kings officers, he waited upon the pope. In his preſence he made a formal confeſſion of his fault, in complying ſo far as he had done with the king's requiſitions, and receiving the archbiſhoprick at his hands. Having again obtained abſolution, he, in the like formal manner, reſigned his church into the hands of the pope, who reſtored him to his dignity, and committed him to the care of the abbot of Pontigni, which was of the order of Ciſtercians, promiſing that he would never deſert him.

Henry, provoked at this reception of the archbiſhop by the king of France, confiſcated all his goods, and even baniſhed all his relations and friends. And ſhewing moreover, a diſpoſition to treat with the antipope, and the emperor, Alexander began to be alarmed, and deſired the biſhops of London and Hereford to apply to the king, in order to accommodate matters. In return, they adviſed the pope to act with moderation, leſt he ſhould loſe the obedience of England, and involve them in much trouble; and in this he ſeemed to acquieſce. But being arrived at Rome in A. D. 1165, and having but little dread of the antipope, he made Becket his legate for all England, except the dioceſe of York.

Thus ſupported, the archbiſhop wrote letters to the king, firſt in a mild ſtrain, but afterwards in

a more lofty one, magnifying the ſacerdotal dignity and threatning the king with the anger of God; which provoked him ſtill more. But fearing leſt the archbiſhop or the popes legates ſhould excommunicate him, and lay his kingdom under an interdict, he appealed to the pope. To this extremity Becket had intended to go; but hearing of the king's illneſs at this time, he deferred it for the preſent, and contented himſelf with excommunicating the biſhop of Oxford and ſome other perſons whoſe conduct offended him, as too complaiſant to the king, and all thoſe who ſhould take any thing belonging to his ſee of Canterbury. At the ſame time he admoniſhed the king to give ſatisfaction to the church; for that, otherwiſe, he ſhould certainly excommunicate him. He alſo condemned the ſixteen articles of antient cuſtoms, and excommunicated all thoſe who ſhould be governed by them.

In theſe circumſtances the king wrote to England, to acquaint the people with his appeal to the pope, and forbad his clergy to obey the archbiſhop. And ſome time after the biſhops, by his order, aſſembled in London, where they wrote to the pope in favour of the king, who, they ſaid, only wiſhed to puniſh, as they obſerved, thoſe of the clergy who ſhould be convicted of great crimes. They alſo complained of the archbiſhop, as having acted improperly

properly, eſpecially irritating the king by his threats of excommunication, and of laying the kingdom under an interdict, and having actually excommunicated ſeveral of their own body: but againſt this they appealed to his holineſs. They alſo wrote a letter of expoſtulation to the archbiſhop himſelf, exhorting him to behave with more patience, humility, and gratitude to the king. In anſwer to this, he reproached them with cowardice, and abandoning the common cauſe of the church.

The king and the archbiſhop having both appealed to the pope, he promiſed to ſend legates to negotiate a peace between them. In the mean time, the king threatened the Ciſtercians with the loſs of all that they held in his territories for receiving his enemy; and in conſequence of this Becket was obliged to leave Pontigni, where he had reſided two years, and he went to Sens, where he remained four years.

When the biſhop of Oxford and the deputies of Becket waited on the mother of Henry, a woman of ſenſe and ſpirit, ſhe excuſed her ſon's conduct, as proceeding from his zeal for juſtice, and irritated by the malice of the biſhops. They ordained, ſhe ſaid, clergymen without choice, and without attaching them to any church; and the conſequence was that, thro' idleneſs, they committed many crimes. A clergyman, ſhe obſerved, without a

title or benefice, had nothing to lose, he feared no temporal punishment, for his holy orders secured him from that, and he did not fear the prison of the bishop, who would rather let him go unpunished than be at the expence of maintaining and guarding him. The bishops, she also said, gave to one clergyman five or six benefices, which occasioned differences about presentations and collations, and lastly that the bishops received money for conniving at the offences of which persons were accused before them. To all this the deputies were unable to make any answer, and owned that there was the true source of the mischief.

In A. D. 1167, the legates arrived from the pope; but though they had several conferences with the king, the archbishop, and the bishops of England, at the head of whom was the bishop of London, who made many complaints of the tyranny of Becket with respect to himself, nothing was concluded. But the king still said he would abide by the decision of the pope.

When Henry and the king of France made peace, the archbishop apprehensive of losing his chief support in the friendship of the latter, and also urged to it by the pope, who always gained more by the differences than the agreement of princes, went to make his submission, and even proposed to refer all the articles of their difference

to the king himſelf, in which, from the knowledge he had of the king's generoſity, he might think himſelf ſafe. But as, in doing this, he added *ſaving the honor of God*, the king was very angry, obſerving that, whatever diſpleaſed himſelf, he would ſay was contrary to the honour of God. The king, with the greateſt firmneſs, propoſed that Becket ſhould only do to him what the greateſt of his predeceſſors in the archbiſhoprick of Canterbury had always done to the meaneſt of his predeceſſors the kings of England. This, however, the haughty prelate refuſed; ſaying, that his predeceſſors had reformed ſome abuſes, but had left others to be reformed by him. This appearing extremely unreaſonable to the lords of both kingdoms, they ſaid he was an obſtinate man, reſiſting the will of both the kings, and ought to be abandoned by them both. Accordingly, both the kings mounted their horſes, and left him without even the common ſalutations.

Some time after this, the king of France conſidering probably the advantages he might ſometime derive from ſuch a ſpirited opponent to his rival, relented in his favour, and allowed him an honourable maintenance as before. Encouraged by this, the archbiſhop again excommunicated all thoſe who had ſeized any thing that belonged to him as archbiſhop of Canterbury, and eſpecially

the biſhop of London; and the conſequence of this was, that the king could hardly find a perſon in his own chapel who would give him the kiſs of peace at maſs, for the clergy were almoſt all excommunicated, either directly or indirectiy, as having communicated with thoſe who were ſo. On this the king applied to the pope to get them abſolved; but all that he could obtain was that the pope would ſend a nuncio to make peace.

Accordingly they met the king at Domfront in France, when the king, not liking the pope's propoſal, which was ſimply to receive the archbiſhop into his favour, began to threaten ſomething, they replied, "Do not threaten us, for we do not fear "you. We belong to a court which is accuſtomed "to command emperors and kings." In their farther conferences, the king, provoked at their inſolence, ſaid he ſhould not value their excommunications an egg. Afterwards, however, he was appeaſed, and promiſed he would reinſtate Becket in his archbiſhoprick; but not being able to agree on the form of the oath to be taken on the occaſion, the king inſiſting on his promiſing with a *ſaving of the dignity of his kingdom*, and the archbiſhop with a *ſaving of the rights of the church*, the conferences, which had been carried on at different places, broke up without any good effect.

The

The king, hearing of a legate to be ſent to England, and dreading the probable conſequences of it, ordered that, if any perſon ſhould be found there with letters from the pope, or the archbiſhop, containing an interdict on the kingdom, they ſhould be ſeized and executed as traitors; and that if any biſhop, abbot, or other eccleſiaſtic, ſhould obſerve the interdict, they ſhould be baniſhed, together with all their relations, and their goods ſhould be confiſcated. All appeals to Rome were forbidden, as alſo the payment of Peter pence, and what there was of that tax already levied was to be kept in the exchequer, to be diſpoſed of as king ſhould direct.

The lay lords conformed to theſe ſpirited orders of the king; but the biſhops and abbots refuſed, eſpecially the biſhops of Wincheſter, of Exeter, and of Norwich; and this ſeems to have encouraged the archbiſhop and the pope to oppoſe to the bold meaſures of the king, meaſures as bold on their ſide. For, after ſome other attempts to promote a reconciliation had proved ineffectual, the pope took off the archbiſhop's ſuſpenſion, in caſe the king did not give ſatisfaction to the church before Eaſter in A. D. 1169; and Becket, anticipating this term a fortnight, ſent orders to all the clergy, that if the king did not make the required ſatisfaction before candlemas, they ſhould diſcontinue

all

all the public offices of religion, except the baptiſm of infants, penance, and the viaticum; for which purpoſe they might ſay maſs, but with the doors ſhut, and excluding all excommunicated perſons. Many perſons the archbiſhop excommunicated by name, eſpecially the biſhops London, and Saliſbury, and the archdeacon of Canterbury.

The pope ſeconded theſe violent proceedings of Becket, giving commiſſion to the archbiſhop of Rouen to lay an interdict on all the king's dominions in France, except that infants might be baptized, and the viaticum given to the dying, if after forty days he did not receive the archbiſhop into favour. He alſo forbad the archbiſhop of York to crown the king's ſon, inſtead of the archbiſhop of Canterbury, whoſe prerogative it had been. This, however, was actually done, no perſon having delivered the pope's letters.

At length the king, fearing the effect of the excommunication, agreed to make peace with Becket; and meeting once more, they behaved to each other with the greateſt complaiſance, eſpecially the king, who was naturally generous, and on this occaſion ſhewed the greateſt command of temper. It does not appear that any particular terms were made, only the king promiſed to make reſtitution of whatever belonged to Becket as archbiſhop.

With

With this promiſe he went to England, where he arrived in November A. D. 1170, and was received with the moſt joyful acclamations by the common people. But refuſing to abſolve the excommunicated biſhops, he was ill received by the friends of the king, and two of them, viz. Roul and Robert de Broc, who were brothers, having offered him ſome inſult, he excommunicated them.

The archbiſhop of York having informed the king of this, and complaining that Becket was again diſturbing the kingdom by his cenſures, the king, being in a violent paſſion, curſed thoſe who had received ſo many favours from him, and would not revenge him of one prieſt, who diſturbed his kingdom, and would deprive him of his dignity. Four knights, hearing of this, agreed among themſelves to diſpatch the archbiſhop; and with this view, leaving the court, which was then in Normandy, they went to Canterbury, and having firſt inſulted the archbiſhop in his own houſe, followed him into the church at veſpres, and ruſhing upon him with their ſwords, ſoon put an end to his life. Seeing their purpoſe, he received them with the greateſt firmneſs, and in dying recommended his cauſe, and that of the church, to God, to the holy virgin, to the holy patron of tnat church, and to the martyr St. Dennis. This was the 29th of December, A. D. 1170. While, after this, the knights

and

and their companions were plundering the archiepiſcopal palace, the common people were gathering the relicks of Becket, and preſerving them with the greateſt care.

The king was ſeriouſly concerned when he heard what had been the conſequence of his raſh language; and dreading the vengeance of the pope, eſpecially as holy Thurſday, on which it was cuſtomary at Rome to publiſh excommunications, was at hand, he made all haſte to diſpatch ambaſſadors to the pope; and as he promiſed abſolute obedience to his orders, the pontiff contented himſelf with excommunicating the murderers of Becket, their abettors, and all who ſhould afford them relief or protection. He then ſent legates to receive the king's ſubmiſſion, which he made in the moſt ample manner, after ſolemnly declaring that he had no knowledge of the murder of the archbiſhop; yet, becauſe his raſh expreſſions had been the occaſion of it, he promiſed to ſend to Jeruſalem two hundred knights to ſerve a year at his expence, to take the croſs himſelf for three years if the pope did not excuſe him, to diſcontinue the antient cuſtom which gave offence to the church, to admit of appeals to Rome, to reſtore to the church of Canterbury all the lands belonging to it, and to receive into his favour all thoſe perſons with whom he had been diſpleaſed on account of Becket. The legates

alſo

alſo enjoined the king ſecret faſting, alms, and other penances. The king's ſon alſo promiſed that he would diſcharge the articles of the penance, if his father ſhould be prevented by death.

The pope being informed of the miracles ſaid to have been wrought at the tomb of Becket, ſolemnly canonized him in February A. D. 1173, as one of the martyrs. The four knights who had murdered him were held in ſo great execration, that no perſon choſe to eat with them, or even to ſpeak to them. Finding themſelves in theſe circumſtances, they went to Rome, and confeſſing their crime, the pope impoſed upon them the penance of going to Jeruſalem; but one of them dying before he arrived thither, and the three others preſently after, all within three years of the deed, it was conſidered as a divine judgment.

Henry himſelf being embarraſſed by the war with his ſons, and almoſt abandoned by his ſubjects, whether in order to recover his popularity with his ſuperſtitious people, or to eaſe his own mind, went to Canterbury, which had immediately become a place of general reſort as a place of pilgrimage, in July A. D. 1174, to make ſatisfaction at Becket's, now *St. Thomas's*, tomb. Being arrived there, he ſet out from the church of St. Dunſtan, which is at a diſtance from the city, cloathed with a tunic of coarſe wool, walking barefooted thro' the dirty ſtreets,

ſtreets, till he came to the tomb. Then proſtrating himſelf, he received the diſcipline properly ſo called from all the biſhops and abbots who were preſent. Alſo every monk in the monaſtery gave him a blow on his naked back. After this, he continued proſtrate all that day, and the night following, without taking any nouriſhment. He then viſited all the altars in the cathedral church, and again returned to the tomb of Becket. On ſaturday at day break he aſked for a maſs in honour of the new ſaint, and then left the city with great joy.

So famous was the tomb of Becket, as an object of pilgrimage, that Lewis king of France, admoniſhed, as he thought, in a dream that he could not otherwiſe obtain relief for his ſon Philip, who was ill, than by making a pilgrimage to Canterbury, applied to Henry for his leave to do it. Henry not only gave him leave, but in a liberal manner defrayed all his expences.

SECTION

SECTION VI.

Of the Monks in this Period.

IN this period, as in the preceding, the orders of monks kept advancing in power and conſideration, notwithſtanding many complaints of their degeneracy; owing to the greater degeneracy, and the greater ignorance, of the ſecular clergy. Alſo, by their ſuperior influence with the popes, to whom they were always peculiarly devoted, and the favour of the princes, to whom they made themſelves uſeful, they continually gained new privileges, tho' in the end theſe were prejudicial to their intereſt.

For the ſervices that Bernard rendered pope Innocent, he, in A. D. 1131, granted a privilege to his houſe at Clairvaux, and all the Ciſtercians, of paying no tythes of their poſſeſſions, which was the cauſe of great animoſity between the Ciſtercians and the other monks, eſpecially thoſe of Clugni.

The monks were always eager to obtain exemptions from the juriſdiction of the biſhops; but they were often ſufferers in conſequence of it. In A. D. 1175 Richard archbiſhop of Canterbury complained to pope Alexander III of theſe ex-

emptions. "Hence it is," ſaid he, "that the "goods of the greater part of the monaſteries are "plundered; the abbot thinks of nothing but "making good chear, and the monks abandon "themſelves to vain diſcourſes. I know," ſays he, "that the pope has granted theſe exemptions "on account of the tyranny of the biſhops; but "the contrary is the caſe now. For the monaſte- "ries which have obtained theſe exemptions, ei- "ther by the authority of the pope, or which is "more common, by falſe bulls, are fallen into the "greateſt trouble and poverty; ſo that the moſt "celebrated monaſteries have refuſed theſe ex- "emptions."

At the council of Lateran, in A. D. 1123, there were great complaints of the incroachments of the monks. "Nothing remains," ſaid the biſhops, "but that they take from us the croſs and the "ring, and make us ſubmit to their ordinations. "They are in poſſeſſion of churches, lands, caſ- "tles, tythes, the oblations of the living, and of "the dead. The glory of canons, and of the cler- "gy is obſcured, ſince the monks, forgetting ce- "leſtial things, ſeek the rights of biſhops with an "inſatiable ambition, inſtead of living in repoſe "according to the inſtitutions of Benedict." On this account it was ordered in this council, that abbots and monks ſhould not appoint public pen-

ance,

ance, visit the sick, give the unction, or sing public masses; that they should receive from the bishops the holy oil, the consecration of their altars, and the ordination of their clergy. At the council of Rheims in A. D. 1131, the monks and the regular canons were forbiddden the practice of the law or of medicine, which was tacitly allowed to the secular clergy, then a necessary evil, because those professions required to be exercised by men of letters. Also, at a council of Tours in A. D. 1163, held by Alexander III, monks were forbidden to leave their monasteries for the exercise of those professions. But it is probable that the decrees of this council were as little observed as those of the former. In all the professions those persons will be employed in whom those who have occasion for them have the greatest confidence.

Bernard made great complaint of the relaxation of discipline at Clugni. "Their great feasts," he said, "consist indeed of fish, but seasoned with "the greatest art, they have a variety of exquisite "wines, they go to the infirmary for the sake "of eating flesh, they wear the richest habits, they "travel with so much pomp, both of men and "horses, that the train of one abbot would suffice "for two bishops. You would take them for lords, "and governors of provinces, rather than pastors, "and spiritual fathers. They can scarce go four

"leagues without carrying all their equipage. "One of them," he ſaid, "he knew who travelled "with no leſs than ſixty horſes." He alſo blamed the magnificence of their churches, for which he ſaid there was no pretence with monks; their cloiſters alſo were ornamented with ridiculous groteſques, and paintings unbecoming their character.

It appears from the writings of Peter the venerable, abbot of Clugni, in the time of Bernard, and who wrote in defence of his monaſtery againſt Bernard, that diſcipline was even then much relaxed in that monaſtery; and at that time it contained about four hundred monks. There were more than three hundred houſes of the order, and about two thouſand depending upon it, ſome of them in the moſt diſtant countries, as one at Jeruſalem, and another at mount Tabor. But after the time of this Peter it fell into the greateſt obſcurity. He governed his monaſtery thirty-five years with ſingular prudence, dying in A. D. 1156. *Berington's Abelard*, p. 390.

Abbots, as well as the ſecular clergy, had ſometimes recourſe to arms. In A. D. 1126 Pons, who had been abbot of Clugni, returning from the holy land, took poſſeſſion of it again by force, which occaſioned a war of ſome continuance. When pope Honorius pronounced a ſentence of ex-

excommunication againſt him, he deſpiſed it, as well as a more ſolemn one at Rome, where both the competitors attended; Pons ſaying that only St. Peter himſelf, who was in heaven, could excommunicate *him*. However, after the ſecond ſentence he was depoſed, and confined in a tower, where ſoon after he died penitent.

Abelard gives a ſhocking account of the ſtate of the monaſtery of St. Gildas, of which he was the abbot. The monks, exaſperated at his attempts to reform them, firſt importunately applied to him for clothing, and other things with which they well knew he was not able to ſupply them; and till that time they had ſpent what they had ſtolen out of the common ſtock, or ſaved out of their allowance, in the maintenance of their concubines and children. After this they proceeded ſo far as to make ſeveral attempts to murder him, eſpecially by poiſon. At the ſame time the lord of the territory, availing himſelf of the notorious conduct of the monks, ſeized ſuch of their poſſeſſions as he liked; and if Abelard went beyond the door of the monaſtery, he was met and threatened by this tyrant or his followers. *Berington's Hiſtory*, p. 189.

But the greateſt acts of violence that we meet with relating to any monaſtery were committed by Oderiſe abbot of Mount Caſſin. Pope Honorius,

when he was biſhop of Oſtia, having had a quarrel with him, demanded of him, when he was pope, a ſum of money for the ſupport of the church. But he replied that, as he had had nothing to do in the election of a pope, he would not bear the expence of one. The pope then ſent for him, and reproved him publicly, as more of a warrior than an abbot, and for ſpending and diſſipating the goods of the monaſtery. Being, after this, ſummoned to appear at Rome, he refuſed to go; and when the pope pronounced againſt him a ſentence of depoſition, he paid no regard to it. The pope then proceeded to the excommunication of him, and all his adherents. But this was ſo far from intimidating him, that it produced an open rupture between them, and cauſed a great diviſion among the monks and the people, who depended upon the monaſtery, ſome taking part with the pope, and others with the abbot. On both ſides they had recourſe to arms; but the friends of the pope overpowering the others, the monks were obliged to expel the abbot, and chuſe another.

With ſome difficulty, one Nicolas, recommended by the pope, was choſen abbot; but when Oderiſe heard of it, he ſeized the caſtle of Bantra; and having collected troops, he deſtroyed thoſe caſtles which acknowledged Nicolas with fire and ſword. On this Nicolas called to his aſſiſtance

Robert

Robert prince of Capua, and took from the monaſtery many valuable things, the gifts of princes and popes, to enable him to carry on the war, which made the monks his enemies. At length, Oderiſe, deſpairing of ſucceſs in any other way, ſubmitted to the pope, and reſigned the monaſtery into his hands. The pope then depoſed Nicolas, and excommunicated his adherents; and the monks, ſhutting their gates againſt him, ſubmitted to his holineſs. At his recommendation, Seignoret was choſen abbot; but the monks, tho' they had yielded thus far, would not permit him to ſwear fealty to the pope. When they were aſked, why he muſt not do what other abbots and biſhops did, they ſaid the monaſtery of Mount Caſſin had never been in any hereſy, or entertained any ſentiment contrary to the church of Rome; and with this anſwer, unſatisfactory as it was, the pope was obliged to be content.

Another inſtance of great diſorder occurs in the monaſtery of Liſieu in A. D. 1182, in conſequence of the frequent abſence of their abbot William in England, on pretence of taking care of the eſtates belonging to his monaſtery in that country. There was no obſervance of the rule within the monaſtery, no hoſpitality, or alms. The monks quarrelled, and ſometimes fought with knives. They had propagated a report that they had a miraculous

well in the monaſtery which they ſaid cured any ſick perſon who was plunged in it ſeven times; but a woman whom they plunged in it died in their arms. One of the monks killed the cook, who complained of the too frequent viſits that he made to his wife; and the ſteward being drunk, and ſtriking two of the monks with a knife in the refectory, they diſpatched him with a pole. Such, however, was the ignorance and ſuperſtition of the people in the neighbourhood, that this murdered ſteward began to be conſidered as a martyr, and the pope was obliged to interfere, and put a ſtop to the adoration they paid him.

We alſo find in this period complaints of the diſorders of ſome who, in ſome meaſure, aſſumed the character of monks or nuns. At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1139, a cenſure was paſſed on ſome women, who, without obſerving any rule, or living in common, would paſs for nuns, living in their own houſes, and receiving gueſts, not always of the beſt character.

There were ſome noble exceptions to this diſorderly ſtate of monaſteries in this age. Among, no doubt, many others, may be reckoned that of St. Denis, of which Abelard was a member, that at Argenteueil, where Eloiſa took the veil, and her own monaſtery at the Paraclet; as well as that of Clugni while it was ſuperintended by Peter the Vene-

Venerable. The nuns at the Paraclet were not only pious, but learned in an extraordinary degree. Eloiſa herſelf was learned far beyond any thing we read of in that age. Her ideas of what ſhould be required of nuns is remarkably free from ſuperſtition. "Rules," ſhe ſays, "which were enacted "for the good of man ſhould vary as he varies. "Why be ſo ſolicitous about things which are in- "different in themſelves, which ſinners and ſaints "may equally practice. Let ſin be prohibited, "but let us have every other indulgence."

She then proceeds to diſcuſs the nature of external obſervances, treating them as things of no value in themſelves. "Virtue alone," ſhe ſays, "has merit with heaven. The true Chriſtian is "ſolely occupied in perfecting his moral character. "It is from the will that evil flows, and not from "what is external to it." She propoſes that her nuns ſhould aſpire to perfection by the practice of domeſtic virtues, that they ſhould ſtrive to be happy in the ſociety of each other, that their tempers ſhould not be ſoured by corporeal macerations, or humiliating puniſhments, and that having the advantage of a ſound mind, and of a body invigorated by ſufficient nouriſhment, they ſhould be able to improve their underſtandings by ſtudy, and edify their neighbours by ſuch virtues as it is

equally the duty of every citizen to practice. *Berington's Abelard*, p. 255.

Eloisa's account of the employment of her nuns is peculiarly interesting, and even edifying. I shall recite the particulars. 1. "We strive," she says, "as far as in us lies to imitate the lives of "the first Christians, by having all things in com-"mon.

2. "Our dress is ordinary and simple, made "of the coarsest wool and flax. But in this, as in "our beds, if we sometimes have not all that "seems necessary, let it be remembered that we "have renounced the world, and its conveniences.

3. "We eat the bread that is laid before us, "sometimes wheaten, and sometimes of other grain. "In the refectory our common fare is legumes, "or such roots as the garden gives us. Milk, "eggs, and cheese, are rarely served, and fish on-"ly when the kindness of our neighbours supplies "us. Our wine is mixed with water. At supper "only salad, or fruit, is allowed us; and when "these fail we bear it without murmuring.

4. "Only the abbess and prioress have a right "to command. Without their permission no one "goes out of the inclosure, or speaks, or gives, "or receives, the smallest trifle.

5. "Would our strength permit us, we should "till our lands, and live by labour. But we

"cannot.

" cannot. We therefore call in the aid of lay bro-
" thers. Any alms which the piety of the faithful
" offers we do not refuſe.

6. " We riſe before break of day, and pro-
" ceed to the church to *matins*. After this, ac-
" cording to the ſeaſon of the year, we either retire
" for a ſhort time to our beds, or we meet in the
" chapter houſe, to read or work. When the
" bell rings we again go to church, where *prime* is
" ſaid, and after that the morning maſs. Again
" we aſſemble in the chapter houſe to confeſs pub-
" licly our faults, and to receive correction. Here
" on ſolemn feſtivals a ſermon is preached. After
" chapter, if there be time, we read till *tierce*, or
" nine o'clock. Then follow high maſs, and
" *ſext*, after which we read or work till *none*, or
" three o'clock. At three we take our meal, ſi-
" lent, and recollected. This finiſhed we return,
" giving thanks to God, go to the church, and
" thence to the chapter houſe, where one of the
" nuns whoſe duty it is makes a diſcourſe to the
" aſſembly. If there be time, we then remain in
" the cloiſters till the hour of *veſpers*. Theſe are
" always ſung. After veſpers we return to the
" cloiſters, where in ſilence and meditation we wait
" the hour of collation, ſupper. After ſupper
" *complin* is ſung in the church, and we remain in
" prayer till, a ſignal is given, at which we all riſe
" from

"from our knees, and then, ſprink'ed with holy "water by the ſuperior, they proceed in proceſſion "thro' the cloiſters to the dormitory, where each "one turns to her bed, and, bleſſing God, retires "to reſt."

Thus, ſays Mr. Berington, lived Heloiſa and her nuns, and with ſome accidental variety the ſame continues to be the rules of moſt orders of religious women. It is ſevere, he adds, and uninviting, but every moment of the day having its proper duty, there is no time for idle ſpeculations, and conſequently no time for the ingreſs of thoſe ideas from which error, uneaſineſs, and miſery ſpring. *Life of Abelard*, p. 394.

In the Eaſt the emperor Manuel Comnenus lamented the decay of monaſtic diſcipline. The monks, he ſaid, were no way diſtinguiſhed from other men, but by their dreſs, their long beards, and their external appearance. He founded a monaſtery, but provided for its maintenance out of the public revenues; ſaying his anceſtors had done wrong in putting monks in poſſeſſion of eſtates in land, when they ought to have lived in deſerts and caverns, as having renounced the world, and not appear in cities, and public places.

Such, however, was the ſuperſtitious reſpect of this emperor for the monkiſh character, that on the unexpected approach of death, he ordered in great

great haſte a monk's dreſs to be brought, and he put it on, tho' it was obſerved to be much too ſhort, and not at all fitting him, and in it he expired. In a manner equally unworthy of a man of ſenſe, died Henry the ſon of Henry II of England in A. D. 1183 at the age of twenty-eight. When he found himſelf at the point of death, he put on a haire oth, and tied a cord about his neck, by which he deſired the biſhops and other eccleſiaſtics who were preſent to draw him out of his bed, and place him on a heap of aſhes. Accordingly they did ſo, putting one great ſtone at his head, and another at his feet; and in that ſituation he received the viaticum.

There were ſome new orders of monks founded in this period, which, on account of the reputation they acquired, deſerve to be mentioned. One of them was that of *Premontré*, founded by St. Norbert archbiſhop of Magdeburg, in A. D. 1120. The monks of this order profeſſed the rule of St. Auſtin; the founder, and his principal followers being canons. They wore a white habit, which was that of the clergy, but all of wool, and his firſt diſciples preferred old and patched garments to new ones. There was no labour too mean for them, their ſilence was continual, and they ate only once a day. Norbert particularly recommended to them three things, neatneſs in the ſervice of the

the altar, the correction of faults in the chapter, and charity to the poor. His inſtitute was confirmed by Honorius in A. D. 1126, the year in which he was made biſhop of Magdeburgh.

A new ſyſtem of monkiſh diſcipline was introduced by Robert de Arbriſſelles. He had ſeveral monaſteries built within one incloſure, for monks and nuns, all ſubject to an abbeſs; alleging the authority of Chriſt, who recommended John to the virgin Mary, and directed him to be obedient to her as to his own mother; tho' he more properly committed her to the care of John. This ſingular diſcipline was embraced by great multitudes. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 410.

In this period aroſe the order of *Carmelites*, beginning with a Calabrian of the name of Berthold, who, with a few companions, took up his abode upon mount Carmel, and lived a life of great auſterity and labour. They were afterwards erected into a regular community by Albert the patriarch of Jeruſalem, and being confirmed by the pope this order was transferred to Europe. Ib. Vol. 2. p. 412.

In A. D. 1198 the order of the *Trinity*, was inſtituted, for the redemption of Chriſtian captives, who were numerous in conſequence of the cruſades. In the ſhort ſpace of forty years there were no leſs than ſix hundred houſes of this order.

The

The monaſtery of Clairvaux became famous in this period, tho' belonging to the Ciſtercian order, by the rigorous diſcipline of St. Bernard. He was born of noble parents in A. D. 1091, at Dijon. His mother had ſix ſons and one daughter, all of whom ſhe devoted to God; but Bernard, her third ſon, in a particular manner; and all the ſeven at different periods embraced the monaſtic life. At the age of twenty-two he entered the monaſtery of Citeaux, with ſeveral young men whom he had perſuaded to join him, and there he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his humility, labour, abſtraction of thought, and ſtudy of the ſcriptures. In A. D. 1115 he was made abbot of Clairvaux, then firſt founded, a place given to the Ciſtercian order by Hugh count of Troyes on the river Aube. The monks of Clairvaux, under the direction of Bernard, found, it is ſaid, ſo much ſatisfaction in their mortifications, that they were even alarmed at it, thinking it more dangerous on account of its being more ſpiritual. To free them from this ſcruple, the authority of the biſhop of Chalons, in whoſe dioceſe they were, was neceſſary. This was called the golden age of the Ciſtercians. In A. D. 1119 pope Calixtus confirmed the regulations of the monaſtery of Citeaux, ordering all the abbots to attend a chapter general of that order every year. This was the firſt order of monks that had *chapters gene-*

general; but it ſerved as a model for all the others.

Lambert, ſurnamed *Le Begue*, or the *Stammerer*, who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf by declaiming againſt the avaricious biſhop of Liege, being permitted to preach by Alexander III in A. D. 1174, aſſembled a number of women, married and ſingle, perſuading them to live in continence; and from him they were called *Beguines*, devoting themſelves to acts of charity. Alſo many women, without making a perpetual vow, lived in common, applying themſelves to prayer and labour.

What particularly diſtinguiſhed this period of our hiſtory was the inſtitution of ſeveral *military orders*, in which two things before thought moſt diſcordant, viz. the profeſſion of arms, and the diſcipline of the monaſtery, were united. The firſt of theſe was that of *the Templars*, which was inſtituted at Jeruſalem in A. D. 1128, taking their appellation from their fixing themſelves near the ſituation of the temple of Solomon. They conſiſted of knights of a religious turn, who promiſed to live in perpetual chaſtity, obedience to their ſuperior, and poverty, like the canons. Their firſt duty was to guard the high roads from robbers, chiefly for the ſafety of pilgrims. They were only nine in number, when ſix of them preſented themſelves at the council of Troyes in A. D. 1128, and received

received a rule in writing, compoſed by St. Bernard; and pope Honorius, and the patriarch Stephen, ordered them to wear a white habit. According to this rule, they were to repeat the public offices intire by day and night, except when their military duty prevented them. They were to recite thirteen paternoſters for matins, ſeven for each of the leſſer hours, and nine for veſpres; becauſe theſe good knights could not read. For each of their brethren who died they were to repeat an hundred paternoſters for ſeven days; and within forty days they were to give to the poor the portion of the deceaſed. They ate fleſh only three times in the week, ſundays, tueſdays, and thurſdays. Each knight might have ſix horſes, and one ſquire. All hunting with hounds or hawks was forbidden them.

Another military order, which in after time acquired greater celebrity than that of the Templars, aroſe after them. It was that of the *knights of the hoſpital of St. John at Jeruſalem.* While this city was under the Mahometans, the Latins obtained leave to have a monaſtery near the church of the holy ſepulchre, where the Latin pilgrims might receive hoſpitality. Theſe monks founded an hoſpital dedicated to St. John. Many donations being made to this hoſpital, the directors of it applied to Rome to be exempt from the juriſdiction of the

patriarch, and alſo from the payment of tythes; and they had obtained various privileges under the popes who preceeded Adrian IV. But under him they were formed into a regular ſociety, dependent only on the pope, conſiſting of three orders, knights, clergy, and ſerving brothers. Of theſe the knights, after taking the habit and the croſs, were ſtrictly forbidden to quit their profeſſion, or adopt any other inſtitution. The bull of their inſtitute is dated the 21ſt of October, A. D. 1154.

This profeſſion of arms ſoon appeared to be ill ſuited to the purpoſes of religion. For the knights of both theſe orders were ſo much degenerated within ſix years of their inſtitution, that all writers agree in deſcribing them as the moſt abandoned of men. In their excurſions they ſpared neither Chriſtians nor Mahometans; and by keeping no faith with the latter, they were the chief cauſe of their own expulſion from the holy land.

After the ſiege of Acre in A. D. 1191, ſome Germans eſtabliſhed an hoſpital for the ſick of their own country, ſuch as had been before at Jeruſalem; and this was the origin of a third military order in imitation of the Templars, and the knights of St. John, which was confirmed by pope Celeſtine III the 23d of February A. D. 1192, and was denominated the order of the *Teutonic knights*, of the houſe of St, Mary at Jeruſalem. They had

the ſame privileges with the knights of the other orders, but they were ſubject to the patriarch and the other prelates.

All theſe three orders originated in the Eaſt, and were occaſioned by the holy war. Two others were eſtabliſhed in Spain, in conſequence of the wars with the Mahometan powers in that country. The firſt was that of the *knights of Calatrava*, being inſtituted for the defence of that city, when it was attacked by the Moors in A. D. 1158. It was confirmed by Alexander III in A. D. 1164. The ſecond was that of the knights of *St. James of Compoſtella*, ſanctioned alſo by Alexander III in A. D. 1176. This order conſiſted of clergy and knights, the latter married, but whoſe wives were conſidered as ſiſters of the order. Their object was to fight the Mahometans, or convert them. They had a *maſter*, and many *commanders*. They lived in common, having no ſeparate property. When once of the order they could never return to common life, or paſs into any other order, without the leave of the maſter. All that they conquered, or that was given them, belonged to the order. For their privileges they were to pay to the pope every year ten Malaquins, which were pieces of Spaniſh money.

SECTION VII.

Of Sectaries that bore some Relation to the Manicheans. Of the Albigenses, and Waldenses.

ALL the labours of the Greek emperors, by argument or by open force, which was too often had recourse to, failed to bring over the Paulicians, and other sectaries whose principles were similar to those of the Manicheans. From Armenia it has been seen that they went to Bulgaria, and thence into the West, where they were distinguished by various names, according to particular circumstances, and often the malice or caprice of their adversaries. Those of this period whom the Byzantine historians call *Bogomiles* were evidently no other than Paulicians. This appellation they received from their being observed to *pray* much, the word in their language having that signification. About the year A. D. 1111 they were persecuted by the emperor Alexis, who ordered their chief, at that time called Basilius, to be burned alive at Constantinople.

This Basilius appears to have been a pious and venerable old man, and he was betrayed into a declaration of his opinions by the emperor and his brother

brother pretending to liſten to his inſtructions, while a ſecretary, concealed behind a curtain, wrote down what he ſaid.

The *Maſſalians*, and alſo the *Euchites* received their appellations from the ſame honourable circumſtance, as the words ſignify perſons diſpoſed to pray. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 441.

According to Euthymius, who publiſhed an account of thoſe Bogomiles by order of the emperor, and chiefly from the converſation between this Baſilius and the emperor, they rejected the Old Teſtament, but received the New. They ſaid the Son and Spirit did not exiſt before the birth of Chriſt, ſo that whatever they meant by this, they could not have been trinitarians, nor were the Manicheans, or any of the antient Gnoſtics; all of whom acknowledged only one God the Father, and Chriſt to be an inferior and created being. Previous to the birth of Chriſt, they ſaid there was another ſon of God, called Satanel, who revolted, and drew many angels into his party; but being driven from heaven, he made this viſible world, deceived Moſes, and gave him the antient law. Jeſus Chriſt, they ſaid, came to deſtroy the power of Satanel; but that his incarnation, death, and reſurrection, were only appearances to deceive him. Theſe are evidently Gnoſtic ſentiments, and like the antient Gnoſtics, they were advocates for auſterity; diſ-

approving of the commerce of the ſexes; they ate no fleſh, or even eggs, and faſted every wedneſday and friday. They rejected the Catholic baptiſm and the euchariſt, but received their proſelytes by what they called the baptiſm of the ſpirit, which is not well explained. They held relics, and croſſes, in great contempt, and conſidered the Catholics as Phariſees and Sadducees.

The emperor Alexis Comnenus took great pains to convert the Paulicians, who were ſettled in Thrace, having frequent conferences with them; ſometimes the whole day, and even the night being taken up with them. Three of their chiefs, on whom his arguments had no impreſſion, were ſent to Conſtantinople, and confined there. Of theſe one recanted, and was releaſed, but the other two were condemned to perpetual impriſonment. By one means or other the emperor ſucceeded in bringing over whole towns and villages to the profeſſion of the Catholic doctrine.

At a council at Conſtantinople in A. D. 1140 the writings of Conſtantine Chryſomalus were condemned, on account of their favouring the opinions of the Bogomiles, as that perſons baptized in infancy were no Chriſtians, becauſe they had not been inſtructed beforehand, that they who have their baptiſm are real Chriſtians, not ſubject to the law, and that Chriſtians have two ſouls, the one im-

impeccable, and the other ſinful. If this repreſentation be juſt, their doctrine had ſome relation to that of the Manicheans.

At another council in Conſtantinople, in A. D. 1143, two biſhops of theſe Bogomiles were introduced. They contended for the rebaptizing of infants, and in all other reſpects held the tenets aſcribed to them by Euthymius. Their writings were condemned, and thoſe who held their opinions were anathematized. In the ſame year, at another council in that city, a monk called Niphon was ordered to be put into cloſe cuſtody for approving the doctrine of the two biſhops abovementioned, and curſing the God of the Hebrews. Coſmas the patriarch of Conſtantinople being much attached to this Niphon, and ſuſpected of the hereſy of the Bogomiles, was depoſed in A. D. 1146.

In the Weſt the doctrines abovementioned had a very wide ſpread, gave greater alarm, and had the moſt ſerious conſequences. In the church of Rome the corruption and abuſes were much greater than in the Eaſt, and excited greater indignation in thoſe who had any thing of the ſpirit of primitive Chriſtianity. Whatever was the origin of the Manichean, or Gnoſtic doctrines in the Weſt, we find them in all parts of it, from Germany and Flanders to Spain and Italy, and they ſowed the ſeeds of the reformation. Extraordinary as it may

appear, the ſame general principles from which were derived the earlieſt corruptions of the Chriſtian doctrine, in the very age of the apoſtles, were the means of bringing about the reformation of Chriſtianity; and having effected this purpoſe, they are now become extinct.

Of Tanchelme, who appeared in Flanders about the year A. D. 1122, we know but little, beſides his declamations againſt the corruptions and abuſes of the Catholics. The churches, he ſaid, were places of proſtitution, the ſacraments were profanations, eſpecially that of the euchariſt, and he forbad the payment of tythes. He is ſaid to have been followed by three thouſand armed men; but no mention is made of any violence they committed, and he himſelf was knocked on the head by a prieſt. He had, however, many followers, and the famous Norbert, founder of the order of Premontré, and a celebrated preacher, was made biſhop of Antwerp with a view to reclaim them; and it is ſaid that by the mildneſs of his addreſs he ſucceeded with many of them. There were many of this ſect in Treves, ſome of whom were examined by the archbiſhop Brunon; and others were diſcovered and burned at Soiſſons.

About the year A. D. 1147 ſome heretics appeared at Cologne, two of whom, a biſhop and his companion, were burned by the populace, and ſuffered with

with great firmneſs. They called themſelves *the poor of Jeſus Chriſt.* They did not wholly reject baptiſm, but only that of infants. Evervin, the provoſt of Stenfield in Weſtphalia, wrote an account of them to Bernard, deſiring that he would confute them; and to ſatisfy him, he publiſhed two ſermons againſt them, in which he ſaid they were the heretics foretold by the apoſtle, forbidding to marry, and abſtaining from meats, &c. not being at all aware, that the whole of the deſcription applied much better to his own church.

But it was in the ſouthern provinces of France that opinions hoſtile to the church of Rome prevailed moſt, and as a moſt cruel perſecution was excited, and the tribunal of the inquiſition was in the next period eſtabliſhed with a view to cruſh them, I ſhall in this period recite the principal particulars of what I find relating to them, in the order in which they occur.

At a council held at Thouloufe in A. D. 1119, when Calixtus II was preſent, thoſe who were called Manicheans were condemned, as perſons who, under the diſguiſe of religion, condemned the ſacraments of baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper, lawful marriage, the prieſthood, and other eccleſiaſtical orders, as heretics, and orders were given to repreſs them by the ſecular power.

At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1139, the canon of a preceding council at Thoulouſe againſt the heretics who rejected the ſacraments of the church was repeated *verbatim*, which ſhews that the hereſy was by no means extinct.

In A. D. 1160 theſe heretics, as they were called, but then bearing the name of *Poplicani*, ſpread from the ſouth of France over to England, and at this time they are ſaid to have been very numerous in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, from which place theſe who appeared in England directly came. They were thirty in all, men and women. Being examined by a council of biſhops at Oxford, Gerard, the chief of them, anſwered, that they were Chriſtians who followed the doctrine of the apoſtles. Being interrogated on particular articles, it appeared that they did not allow of baptiſm or the Lord's ſupper, nor approved of marriage, and made no account of the authority of the church. They were not affected by any exhortations, or menaces, ſaying, when they were threatened, *Bleſſed are they that are perſecuted for righteouſneſs ſake.* After their condemnation by this council, the king ordered them to be burned on the forehead, to be driven out of the city, forbidding any perſon to receive them, or give them any relief. However, they received this cruel ſentence with joy; ſaying *Bleſſed are you when men*

ſhall

shall hate you, and persecute you. As it was then winter, and no person gave them any entertainment, they perished miserably of cold and hunger.

In France the proceedings against these people were similar to those in England. At a council at Tours under Alexander III, in A. D. 1163, when they had spread from Thoulouse to Gascony, and other places, it was forbidden to give them any retreat or protection, to have any commerce with them, in buying or selling, under pain of excommunication. When they were discovered, they were ordered to be imprisoned, their goods were to be confiscated, and their meetings, as far as possible, prevented.

In A. D. 1167 they again appeared in great numbers in Flanders, where also they were called *Poplicani*. They offered the archbishop six hundred marks of silver if he would not molest them; but he refusing the sum, they appealed to the pope. At Vezelai the same year seven of these heretics were burned, and one of them, who had asserted his innocence, submitted to the trial by water, and being found guilty, was publicly whipped.

In A. D. 1176 the archbishop of Narbonne, and many other bishops of the province, called an assembly to judge some heretics called *Goodmen*, which was then, and long after, the distinguishing appellation of plain common people, or those who were

were not noble. They were, however, supported by the nobility of Lombers, a small town two miles from Albi, and the sentence was pronounced by the bishop of Albi. Being questioned concerning their principles, they were particularly cautious not to advance any thing for which they had not the express authority of scripture, which they interpreted literally. They allowed of no oaths, and declaimed violently against the clergy, as wolves in sheep's clothing. In other respects they appear to have been the same with those, who in the same parts had been commonly called Manicheans. They were condemned as heretics, but it is not said what was done to them.

In the same year there appeared in Lombardy heretics called *Cathari*, probably from their pretending to greater purity than the members of the established church, like the *Puritans* in England; and sometimes *Runcarians*, who were labouring people employed in felling trees and clearing the ground, being in general persons in the lower classes of life. They were much encouraged at Milan, when it was in the power of the schismatics, and they made great progress in that neighbourhood, which excited the zeal of the bishop Galbon, who often preached against them.

These people got about this time the appellation of *Albigenses*, and in A. D. 1177 their party appears,

appears, from a letter of Rainier V count of Thoulouſe to the abbot and chapter of the Ciſtercians, to have been very ſtrong in thoſe parts of the country. "This hereſy has gained," he ſays, "even "the prieſts. Churches are abandoned and ruin- "ed, baptiſm is refuſed, the euchariſt held in abo- "mination, penance deſpiſed, the creation of man "rejected, as well as the reſurrection of the fleſh, "and all the myſteries. In fine they introduce "the two principles, and yet nobody thinks of op- "poſing theſe wretches. I am willing to employ "the ſword that is put into my hands, but my "forces are not ſufficient, becauſe the nobles of my "eſtates are infected with theſe errors, and draw "great multitudes after them." He then expreſſes a wiſh that the king of France would come and put an end to the miſchief.

On hearing this repreſentation, the kings of France and England agreed in A. D. 1178 to go in perſon, and drive theſe heretics out of the province of Thoulouſe; but before they did this, they ſent prelates to reaſon with them, and convert them. Theſe, arriving at Thoulouſe, found the chief of the heretics to be one Peter Moran, an old man, very wealthy, and of great conſideration in that city. Being found to be a heretic, he was ſent to priſon; and tho' he recanted, all his property was confiſcated, and he was farther ordered to leave the coun-

country in forty days, to ſerve the poor at Jeruſalem three years, to go every ſunday over all the churches in Thouloufe barefoot, and in his ſhirt to receive diſcipline. At the ſame time Roger of Beders, a lord of that country, who is ſaid to have held the biſhop of Albi priſoner under a guard of heretics, tho' it is not ſaid on what account, was declared to be a heretic, and a traitor; he was publicly excommunicated, and war was declared againſt him. Two of their chiefs demanding a public hearing, it was granted them in the cathedral of Thouloufe, when many perſons were preſent; and tho' they denied many things that were laid to their charge, ſuch evidence was produced againſt them, that they were excommunicated, and baniſhed.

We now begin to perceive the approach of a more ſerious perſecution. At a council of Lateran in A. D. 1179 it was ordered, that "tho' the "church rejects bloody executions, it ought to be "aided by the laws of Chriſtian princes; and the "fear of corporal puniſhment has ſometimes made "perſons have recourſe to ſpiritual remedies;" and ſince the heretics called Cathari, Paterini, and Poplicani, were ſo fortified in Gaſcony, that they did not hide themſelves, but taught their errors publicly, they were anathematized, together with all thoſe who protected them.

Three

Three years after this, viz. in A. D. 1181 the pope's legate Henry, who from being abbot of Clairvaux, was made a cardinal, and biſhop of Albana, being ſent to France, marched againſt the Albigenſes with a great army, took the caſtle of Lavoux, and obliged Roger de Beziers, and many others, to abjure their hereſy. In the beginning of the year A. D. 1183 the biſhop of Rheims condemned to the flames, with confiſcation of their goods, many of the Patarins, clergy, gentlemen, peaſants, and women.

In the year following, viz. A. D. 1184, at a council at Verona, where pope Lucius III. attended by the emperor, preſided, all the hereſies then exiſting were condemned by name; the biſhops were required to make ſtrict inquiry after them, and the temporal powers to puniſh them according to the degrees of their guilt, as diſtinguiſhed by thoſe who were *convicted*, *penitent*, and *relapſed*. In this, ſays Fleury, we ſee the origin of the *inquiſition*, which was eſtabliſhed afterwards. Among the heretics condemned at this time were ſome who were called *Paſſagins*, who contended for the ſtrict obſervance of the law of Moſes, denied the trinity, and condemned the Fathers and the church of Rome in general. Another claſs of heretics condemned at this time are called *Humiliés*. They were originally men and women who lived in great poverty,

poverty by the labour of their hands, the men altogether in one place, and the women in another. The pope approved of their inſtitute, and gave them leave to preach even in churches, with the leave of the prelates. But many under that diſguiſe preached other doctrines.

The *poor of Lyons*, which is another claſs of heretics cenſured at this council, aroſe in A. D. 1160, from one Peter Valdo, who being ſtruck with the ſudden death of a perſon in a public aſſembly, diſtributed a large ſum of money to the poor, and admoniſhed others to do the ſame, and live in voluntary poverty, in imitation of Chriſt and the apoſtles. Being in ſome meaſure learned, Valdo explained the ſcriptures to his followers, and tho' reproved for this by the clergy, he perſiſted in doing it, exclaiming againſt theſe on account of their corrupt morals and doctrine. Some ſay the Waldenſes took their name from this Valdo; but, as they exiſted in the vallies of Piedmont long before this time, and profeſſed a purer doctrine than that of the church of Rome it is more probable that if this was not his original name, which is very poſſible, he might take it from them. Theſe poor of Lyons were diſtinguiſhed by wearing wooden ſhoes with the ſign of the croſs upon them. From this circumſtance they alſo got the appellation of *Sabbatati*, and

and *Infabbatati*, *fabot* being the word for a wooden ſhoe in France. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 451. Theſe poor of Lyons were ſo far from conſidering themſelves as heretics that they applied to pope Innocent III for the confirmation of their order but were refuſed. *Giannone*, Vol. 2. p. 65.

The Albigenſes had biſhops, and each of them had two vicars, an elder and a younger. They had alſo deacons, and the veneration in which the common people held their clergy almoſt exceeds belief. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 446.

All that the proper *Waldenſes* aimed at in this reſpect was to reduce the form of church government, and the manners of the clergy, to their primitive ſimplicity. They denied the ſupremacy of the pope, and ſaid that the miniſters of religion were obliged, like the apoſtles, to procure a ſubſiſtence by the labour of their hands. They remonſtrated againſt indulgences, confeſſion to a prieſt, prayers for the dead, and purgatory. They interpreted the ſermon on the mount in a literal ſenſe, condemning all wars, law ſuits, and oaths. They had biſhops, preſbyters, and deacons; and the common people were divided into two claſſes the *perfect*, and *imperfect*, the former diveſting themſelves of all worldly poſſeſſions. Some of the Waldenſes allowed the Catholic church to be a

true church, and its ſacraments valid; but others conſidered the pope as Antichriſt. Ib. p. 454.

Other heretics condemned on this occaſion are called *Joſepins*, or *Meſopins*, but the reaſon of the denomination is not known.

In A. D. 1198 one Terric, a leading perſon among the Poplicani, being diſcovered in Nevernois, was burned, and many other perſons of good fortune at Charité were excommunicated, and delivered over to the ſecular arm.

The perſons who diſtinguiſhed themſelves the moſt in this claſs of heretics, or rather reformers, and who therefore deſerve a more particular mention were Peter of Bruis, and from whom the ſectaries were ſometimes called *Petrobruſſians*, and an Italian of the name of *Henry*, from whom many were denominated *Henricians*. They both preached with ſo much ſucceſs in Provence, Dauphiny, and the ſouth of France in general, that many perſons were rebaptized, the churches profaned, the altars overturned, croſſes burned, prieſts whipped, monks impriſoned, or compelled to marry. They had even made a bonfire of many croſſes, and to ſhew the greater contempt of them, they cooked victuals at the fire, and invited the people publicly to eat of them, tho' it was on good friday.

In

In A. D. 1147 Eugenius III ſent Alberic biſhop of Oſtia to combat theſe heretics, and he was accompanied by Bernard. Peter abbot of Clugni, who gives an account of this preaching expedition, employs a long letter to refute the heretics; and from this it appears that they rejected the authority of the old teſtament, the baptiſm of infants, the ſacrifice of the maſs, and prayers for the dead. We know very little of the hiſtory of Peter de Bruis, but ſoon after this miſſion of Alberic he was burned alive at St. Gilles, after having preached near twenty years.

Henry was in the dioceſe of Mans, where he was favourably received by Hildebert the biſhop, who was then ſetting out for Rome. Henry was then a young man, very tall, had a ſtrong voice, and a long beard. He walked barefooted, and had a great appearance of ſanctity. As he was very eloquent, the people crouded to him, and the effect of his preaching was an univerſal rage againſt the clergy; ſo that many people would have no dealings with their domeſtics. They would even have pulled down their houſes, and ſtoned them, if the lords had not interpoſed. Hildebert, in conſequence of this, not being well received by the people, baniſhed Henry from his dioceſe.

After this we find Henry in the neighbourhood of Thouloufe, and there he was when Alberic and

Bernard undertook their expedition. Accordingly, before they went thither Bernard wrote to Alphonſo, count of St. Gilles and Thouloufe, in whoſe territories Henry was, informing him of all the miſchief he had done, and deſiring that he would make particular inquiry into the manner in which he had left Laufanne, Mans, Poitiers, and Bourdeaux, in all which places he had no doubt been.

According to this letter of Bernard, this reformer muſt have preached with great effect, "The "churches," he ſays, "are without people, the "people without prieſts, the prieſts deſpiſed, the "churches no longer conſidered as holy places, "nor the ſacraments holy things; the feſtivals are "not celebrated, men die without penance, or "communion, and infants are not baptized." A diſciple of Henry named Pons was then at Peregord, but the city the moſt infected with his opinions was Albi. At this city the legate arrived at the end of June, where the people met him on aſſes, and with beating of drums, by way of mockery; and when he performed maſs, he was hardly attended by thirty perſons. Notwithſtanding this unpromiſing reception, when Bernard preached, the writer of his life, who repreſents him as working miracles wherever he went, ſays that he converted all the people; which, he ſays, was the greateſt

greateſt miracle that he wrought in all this journey. He preached with the ſame ſucceſs at Thouloufe, ſo that Henry, being ſummoned to ſurrender himſelf, fled, and his followers, who on this occaſion are called *Arians*, with him. Bernard followed his ſteps, and at length he was apprehended, and being put into the power of the biſhops, and carried before pope Eugenius, who was holding a council at Rheims, he was committed a cloſe priſoner in A. D. 1148, and ſoon after he died. He had, however, a milder fate than Peter de Bruis. This Henry is by ſome called a diſciple of Peter de Bruys. But this is improbable. The latter could not bear the ſight of a croſs, whereas the former carried a crucifix in his hand. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 448.

He, however, adopted all the opinions of Peter, and added to them ſome of his own. Of thoſe the principal were that ſpiritual ſongs are an inſult to the deity; that he only delights in pious affections; that he is not to be invoked by loud vociferation, nor ſoothed by the harmony of muſic: This is the firſt time that I have met with this ſentiment, which was afterwards adopted by the Quakers. *Berington's life of Abelard*, p. 315.

Calin, a chief of Boſnia, having received a great number of Paterins, Innocent III wrote to Emeric king of Hungary in A. D. 1200, charging

him to compel Calin to drive them out of his territories, with the confiſcation of their goods; otherwiſe he would proceed againſt all the kingdom of Hungary.

About the ſame time many Manicheans, as they were called, were diſcovered at Orvieto near Rome, whither this doctrine had been brought from Florence by one Diotoſalvi, a perſon of a venerable and modeſt appearance, about the year A. D. 1150. He preached in conjunction with one Gerard Marſon in Campania. They were driven out of Orvieto by the biſhop, but were ſucceeded by two women, who leading a pious and contemplative life, drew many into their opinions. On this the biſhop, aſſiſted by the civil officers, purſued them with ſo much vigour, that ſome were hanged, ſome beheaded, ſome burned, and others baniſhed; and thoſe who died were deprived of the rites of Chriſtian burial. In the abſence of this biſhop, the heretics got the upper hand again; but in A. D. 1199 pope Innocent ſent Peter di Parenzo, a noble Roman, to ſuppreſs them; which he ſeemed to have done by violence of every kind; but at length the heretics having gotten him into their power, murdered him.

In the ſame year Bertram, biſhop of Metz, informed the pope of many heretics being in his dioceſe. They had tranſlated into French the goſpels,

the

the epiſtles of Paul, the pſalms, the books of morals, Job, and ſome others, which they read with great ardour, holding aſſemblies in ſecret, and exhorting one another, in contempt of the prieſts, the pope, and the hierarchy in general.

In A. D. 1201 Evraud, a knight, and ſteward of Henry count of Nevers, was convicted of the hereſy of the Bulgarians, which did not differ from that of thoſe mentioned above, and was burned in public at Nevers. On this his nephew, a canon of Nevers, infected with the ſame hereſy, fled to the province of Narbonne, where he was received with honour, but thought proper to change his name.

Such being the ſtate of things in all the ſouthern provinces of France, we cannot wonder that the popes and the court of Rome were alarmed. The whole craft was in danger, and therefore, as political men, they exerted themſelves to the utmoſt to extirpate theſe heretics, employing all the power they had for the purpoſe, and in the next period we ſhall ſee the ſhocking cruelties they were guilty of. At preſent they only tried ſome preparatory meaſures. Innocent III ſent into thoſe provinces two Ciſtercian monks, Rainier and Gui, in order to convert theſe heretics; but at the ſame time he ordered all princes, counts, and other lords, to aſſiſt them with their ſecular power; and after the

ſentence of excommunication pronounced againſt them, to confiſcate their goods, baniſh them, or puniſh them more ſeverely, if they remained in the country. Rainier was alſo inſtructed to excommunicate thoſe lords who would not join him in this, and lay their eſtates under an interdict. The pope alſo granted to thoſe who engaged in this extirpation of heretics the ſame privileges as if they had gone on the pilgrimage to Rome, or Compoſtella. This, however, was only a prelude to what we ſhall find in the next period.

Spain was by no means free from this infection of hereſy. In A. D. 1197 Peter II of Arragon ordered all his officers to drive the Waldenſes out of his territories, or to burn them alive, and confiſcate their property.

SECTION VIII.

Of Arnold of Breſcia, and Abelard.

THE reformers of religion, in conſequence, no doubt, in ſome meaſure, of their having been generally oppreſſed by the civil powers, have almoſt always been the zealous advocates of civil liberty; and on the other hand the friends of civil

civil liberty have often been ſuſpected of hereſy. This was the caſe with Arnold, a citizen of Breſcia, in the North of Italy, in this period. He had formerly been a diſciple of Abelard; but it does not appear that he derived any of his principles from him. Whether Arnold had ever been in a monaſtery does not appear, but he wore the dreſs of a monk, and declaimed againſt the biſhops, without ſparing the pope, or even the monks; nor did he flatter the laity, tho' he exhorted them to aſſert their liberties.

What were the peculiar opinions of Arnold does not appear, but he was ſuſpected of entertaining ſentiments unfavourable to baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper. His diſcourſes had ſuch an effect at Breſcia, and many other cities in Lombardy, that the clergy were held in the greateſt contempt, and became the objects of public raillery. Being complained of by the biſhop, he was ordered to be ſilenced, on which he retired to Zuric, and infected all that country with his opinions. In the mean time he was condemned at the council of Lateran in A. D. 1139.

Arnold being now in the dioceſe of the biſhop of Conſtance, Bernard, to whom nothing relating to the intereſt of the church was indifferent, wrote to him to urge him to guard againſt ſo dangerous a perſon, whoſe auſtere life gave credit to his

doctrine; so that he more easily insinuated his errors, and those of Abelard. He advised the bishop not to banish, but confine him, lest he should only go from place to place, and thereby propagate his errors the more widely. What was the consequence of this advice does not appear. But on the accession of pope Eugenius in A. D. 1145, Arnold came to Rome, and joined the disaffected party there, exhorting them to follow the example of the antient Romans, to rebuild the Capitol, restore the dignity of the senate, and the order of knights; saying that the pope had nothing to do with the civil government of the city, and that he ought to be content with his spiritual jurisdiction. We shall see in a later period that this was a favourite opinion of many of the people of Rome, and on this was founded the influence of Rienzi in the time of Petrarch.

Ten years after this we still find Arnold at Rome, and preaching publicly. But one of his followers having wounded a cardinal in A. D. 1145, Adrian IV laid the city under an interdict, in consequence of which the people applied to him, promising to expel Arnold and his disciples from the city, and its territory, which accordingly was done. And presently after this, falling into the hands of the emperor Frederic Barbarossa, then in Lombardy, three cardinals were sent to demand him, and

and being delivered up to them, he was publicly burned alive, and his aſhes were thrown into the Tiber, leſt the people ſhould honour his relics, as thoſe of a martyr. Such was the end of this reformer, as well as of many others, in all ages.

Abelard is by no means to be claſſed with Arnold of Breſcia, tho' he was deemed a heretic, and expoſed himſelf to the perſecution of Bernard as ſuch. In fact, they were rivals in popularity. However, Abelard acted ſo conſpicuous a part on the public theatre in this period, that his hiſtory deſerves to be related. He was born near Nantes in Bretagne in A. D. 1079, and when he was grown up addicted himſelf chiefly to the ſtudy of logic, under Roſcellin of Compeigne, and then under William de Champeaux at Paris, reckoned the ableſt teacher of his time. But Abelard ſoon rivalled his maſter, and taught at Melun, tho' he afterwards returned to ſtudy rhetoric of Champeaux at St. Victor. After this he fixed his ſchool at mount St. Ganvieve, then out of Paris.

Champeaux being made biſhop of Soiſſons, Abelard went to ſtudy theology of Anſelm biſhop of Laon; but ſoon deſpiſing him, tho' a venerable old man, he himſelf undertook to explain the ſcriptures without having regularly prepared himſelf for doing it, on which Anſelm drove him from Laon, and he returned to Paris; where teaching logic,

logic, and theology, he was attended by a prodigious number of ſcholars from all parts; but his ſucceſs was the cauſe of his ruin. Undertaking the inſtruction of Heloiſa, niece to Fulbert, a canon of the church of Paris, a young woman of an uncommonly fine genius, and great accompliſhments, he had a criminal connection with her; and when ſhe was with child he removed her to his ſiſters where ſhe was delivered of a ſon; and he promiſed the uncle, who was much irritated, to marry her, provided it could be done privately. Accordingly, tho' much againſt her will, they were married in the preſence of the uncle, and a few other witneſſes, but only had private interviews afterwards.

Fulbert, willing to repair the honour of his family, contrary to his promiſe, publiſhed the marriage, tho' Heloiſa denied it, and was on that account ill uſed by him. On this Abelard removed her to the nunnery of Argenteuil, where ſhe had been educated, and took the habit, but not the veil. Fulbert, provoked at this, cauſed Abelard to be ſurprized in the night, and caſtrated. When he was recovered, he embraced the monaſtic life, and perſuaded Heloiſa to do the ſame; he entering at St. Denis, and ſhe at Argenteuil. After this Abelard again opened his ſchool, and he had

ſo

ſo many ſcholars that they could hardly find lodging or victuals. Some came even from Rome.

In this ſituation Abelard publiſhed a book on the ſubject of the trinity, in which he maintained that, as in logic the propoſition, aſſumption, and concluſion, are the ſame diſcourſe; ſo the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the ſame eſſence, but that the Father alone is the almighty. In this he had no ſuſpicion that he was advancing any hereſy; but ſubtle diſtinctions and nice compariſons being then much admired, he probably thought he had hit upon one that would do him credit. His popularity, however, together with his vanity, and the aſperity of his temper, had raiſed him many enemies, and among them was the redoubtable Bernard. He was, therefore, accuſed of hereſy at the council of Soiſſons in A. D. 1121, and without any diſcuſſion of the ſubject, his book was condemned as heretical, and he was ordered to throw it into the fire with his own hands, and alſo to read, as the confeſſion of his faith, the creed of Athanaſius. This mortifying ceremony he ſubmitted to go thro', tho' not without many tears, and as a puniſhment, he was confined in the monaſtery of St. Medard at Soiſſons. After this he was ordered to return to the monaſtery of St. Denis; but giving offence by ſomething that he advanced concerning that St. Denis, he fled from the place;

place; and having obtained leave to lead a monaſtic life wherever he pleaſed, he retired to a ſolitary place in the dioceſe of Troyes, where he built an oratory, and called it *the Paraclet*, and was reſorted to as before by a great number of pupils. This ſucceſs again excited envy, and dreading the ill offices of St. Norbert and Bernard, he took upon him the conduct of an obſcure abbey at St. Gildas in the dioceſe of Vannes in Bretagne, and gave the Paraclet to Heloiſa, where ſhe eſtabliſhed herſelf as abbeſs. At St. Gildas he met with every mortification he could well have from the behaviour of the monks, and the lords in the neighbourhood; but all this did not ſatisfy the malice of his enemies.

In A. D. 1139 complaint was made by William abbot of St. Thieri to Geoffroy biſhop of Chartres and St. Bernard, of errors in the writings of Abelard. He was particularly charged with aſſerting that in God the terms Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are improper, that the Father alone is almighty, the Son a certain power, viz. wiſdom, and the Holy Spirit no proper power at all, being only the divine goodneſs. He was moreover charged with advancing that the Holy Spirit is not of the ſubſtance of the Father and of the Son, as the Son is of the ſubſtance of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit is the ſoul of the world. He was

alſo

alſo accuſed of maintaining that man has the power of willing what is good, without the help of divine grace, and that we derive from Adam only the puniſhment, and not the guilt, of original ſin.

After ſome correſpondence on the ſubject, Abelard challenged his opponent to a public diſputation, at a council which was to be held at Sens in A. D. 1140; when the king of France was to be preſent, and a great number of learned eccleſiaſtics. Bernard accepted the challenge, and coming prepared for the purpoſe produced the books of Abelard, and called upon him to defend certain articles which he objected to in them as abſurd, and heretical. But Abelard, perceiving the unfavourable diſpoſition of the audience, contented himſelf with appealing to the pope. The council, offended at his conduct, condemned his doctrine, but out of regard to his appeal, ſpared his perſon; but they exhorted the pope to confirm their ſentence left, as they ſaid, the evil ſhould extend itſelf; ſince they ſaw that he drew a great multitude after him, ſo that a ſpeedy remedy was neceſſary.

Bernard alſo wrote to the pope, complaining of Abelard, as having engaged his diſciple Arnold of Breſcia to attack the church in conjunction with him; obſerving that they had an appearance of piety in their manner of living, which ſerved to ſeduce many. Abelard, he ſaid, extolled the philoſophers,

ſophers, in order to viliſy the doctors of the church. He ſtrongly urged him to ſuppreſs this hereſy, after having extinguiſhed the ſchiſm. "Nothing "more," he ſaid, "is wanting to your crown." In animadverting upon the errors of Abelard, he charged him in this letter with advancing that the end of Chriſt's incarnation was only to inſtruct us by his example and his doctrine, repreſenting him, in fact, as a Pelagian.

The pope, in compliance with theſe requeſts, which with reſpect to Bernard were equivalent to commands, in A. D. 1149 paſſed a ſentence of condemnation on Abelard, impoſing upon him, as a heretic, perpetual ſilence, and ordering that all his followers ſhould be excommunicated. He likewiſe directed that Abelard and Arnold ſhould be confined in ſeparate monaſteries, and that their books ſhould be burned wherever they could be found.

Notwithſtanding this ſentence, Abelard purſued his journey to Rome, in order to proſecute his appeal. But ſtopping at the abbey of Clugni, where he was kindly received by Peter the abbot, by his advice he made his peace with Bernard, retracted every thing he had advanced that had given offence, and conſented to paſs the remainder of his life in that monaſtery. To this the pope conſented; and when Abelard had, in a moſt inoffenſive

ſive and exemplary manner, paſſed two years in that monaſtery, he died. His remains were carried to the Paraclet, where they were received in a manner the relation of which is very affecting by Heloiſa, who ſurvived him more than twenty years; he dying in A. D. 1142 and ſhe in A. D. 1163. See Mr. *Berington's* well written, and moſt inſtructive *life of Abelard.*

SECTION IX.

Of the various Opinions advanced in this Period.

AS this was an age of much ſpeculation, and metaphyſical ſubtlety, we are not ſurprized at the advancement of ſingular opinions. Had the church had leſs power, and there not had been a diſpoſition ſo very hoſtile to all innovations, this turn for ſpeculation might have had valuable conſequences. It was the introduction of the works of Ariſtotle into the ſchools of Chriſtians that was the chief cauſe of this refinement, and four men particularly diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their attachment to his philoſophy; Peter Lombard biſhop of Paris, Abelard, Peter of Poitiers, and Gilbert of Poreé biſhop of Poitiers.

Their opinions were ſometimes called the *four labyrinths*, into which the old church men ſaid the church had fallen thro' this philoſophy.

Gilbert of Porée had advanced that the *divine eſſence* was not *God*. He was likewiſe charged with advancing various other ſubtleties about the diſtinction of the perſons in the trinity; and as every new opinion, or ſingular mode of expreſſion, excited alarm, he was examined on the ſubject at Paris in A. D. 1146, and the year following at Rheims, in a council held by pope Eugenius, Bernard being preſent and conducting the examination. But, after much diſputation, Gilbert made the conceſſions that were required of him, and thus the buſineſs terminated, without any ſerious conſequences.

In the catechiſm of the Greek church there was an anathema againſt the *God of Mahomet*, as neither *begetting nor begotten*. This the emperor Manuel Comnenus wiſhed to have taken away, as it ſhocked the Mahometans, that God ſhould be anathematized. But the prelates rejected the propoſal, ſince the anathema was not againſt the true God, but a mere phantom. However the emperor perſiſting the anathema was at length changed for one againſt "Mahomet, his doctrine, and his ſect,"

In

In A. D. 1166 a council was held at Conſtantinople on occaſion of one Demetrius having reported that the Germans were in an error for maintaining that the Son was at the ſame time equal to the Father, and inferior to him. This queſtion having been the ſubject of much diſputation about ſix years, the council, without entering into the merits of the queſtion, contented themſelves with pronouncing an anathema againſt thoſe who did not aſſent to the doctrine of the church. Nothing of any importance, or at all new, was advanced on the occaſion, and nothing of conſequence followed from it.

Peter Lombard having aſſerted that Jeſus Chriſt *as man* was not, ſtrictly ſpeaking, a *thing* or *ſubſtance*, it gave great offence to pope Alexander III, who propoſed to have the opinion condemned at the council of Lateran in A. D. 1179; but ſome diſciples of Lombard ſtanding up to defend it, the diſcuſſion was deferred. Afterwards, however, the pope ordered his legate in France to aſſemble the doctors of the ſchools of Paris, Rheims, and other cities, and to forbid the teaching of it, under pain of anathema.

In Lombardy we find a ſect called *Paſſaginians*, who held that the law of Moſes was obligatory on Chriſtians, excepting, however, what related to ſa-

crifices. They circumcifed their children, abftained from the meats prohibited in the pentateuch, and they obferved the Jewifh fabbath. Like the Jews they alfo denied the doctrine of the trinity, maintaining that Chrift was the firft and pureft creature of God. Nor, fays Mofheim, are we to wonder at this, when we confider the great number of Arians with which Italy formerly abounded. Vol. 2. p. 456.

In Burgundy we find perfons called *Caputiati*, from a fingular kind of cap which they wore, and in which they put a leaden image of the virgin Mary. They profeffed, as it is faid, to level all diftinctions, to abrogate magiftracy, and reftore primitive liberty. Thefe were probably mere calumnies, the fame things being frequently charged on other advocates for liberty civil or ecclefiaftical. However Hugo bifhop of Auxerre employed arms, inftead of arguments, to reduce them. *Mofheim*, Vol. 2. p. 457.

Many Chriftians in the Eaft were attached to the Eutychian doctrine; and being no longer fubject to the emperor of Conftantinople, they openly profeffed their opinions, and formed feparate churches. Both the Armenians, and the generality of the Egyptian Chriftians, were of this clafs. Many perfons, who were more offended than was

neceſ-

neceſſary at theſe diviſions among Chriſtians, took much pains to unite them. In A. D. 1170 Norſeſis the Catholic, as he was called, a patriarch of the Armenians, wrote to the emperor Manuel Comnenus on the ſubject of the difference between their church and that of Conſtantinople, and in conſequence of this he ſent Theorian, who had a long conference with Norſeſis, which terminated in his intire ſatisfaction; ſo that he promiſed to uſe his beſt endeavours to bring over his nation to acknowledge the council of Chalcedon, and to condemn thoſe who were condemned by it. Nothing, however, ſeems to have followed from it; and to this day the two churches are as far ſeparated from each other as ever.

The Greek and Latin churches, tho' they had little communication in this period, were not in a ſtate of declared hoſtility to each other. The emperor Manuel Comnenus had a correſpondence with pope Alexander III; and William archbiſhop of Tyre ſpending a winter at Conſtantinople, ſpeaks in the higheſt terms of his piety; which ſhews, ſays Fleury, that the Latin church then conſidered the Greek church as Catholic, and that the ſchiſm between them was not properly formed. But Theodore Balſamon, in his Commentary on the Nomocanon of Photius, ſpeaks of the biſhops of antient Rome as cut off from other churches,

and laments it, expreſſing his hope of their converſion; and this is the firſt direct proof of the ſchiſm of the Greeks, or the ſeparation of the two churches.

So great was the inveteracy of the Greeks againſt the Latins, inflamed, no doubt, by their conduct in the cruſades, that in April A. D. 1182 they made a general maſſacre of thoſe that were ſettled in Conſtantinople. They had been in great favour with the emperor Manuel Comnenus, who employed them in preference to the Greeks, finding them better qualified to ſerve him. This made them exceedingly odious to the Greeks, the prieſts alſo continually repreſenting them as heretics, for not conforming to their cuſtoms. The Greeks did not, on this occaſion, ſpare even the churches of the Latins, but burned them, together with all the perſons who had taken refuge in them, without any diſtinction of prieſts, monks, or laymen; and among the reſt periſhed John a cardinal ſubdeacon, who had been ſent to promote an union between the two churches. After cutting off his head, they tied it to the tail of a dog, and thus dragged it thro' the ſtreets. The moſt humane ſold to the Turks thoſe who took refuge with them; and of thoſe there were ſaid to have been more than four thouſand, of every age, and of both ſexes. Thoſe of the Latins who eſcaped this maſſacre took a cruel revenge

revenge for it. For, aſſembling near Conſtantinople, they went from the mouth of the Helleſpont to the black ſea, killing all the inhabitants they met with, plundering monaſteries, and churches, in which they found immenſe booty. They alſo collected many gallies, and thereby raiſed a formidable fleet.

There are few periods in this hiſtory in which ſomething does not occur relating to the ordinances of baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper. About the year A. D. 1192 there was a diſpute whether the words *I baptize thee* were not neceſſary to Chriſtian baptiſm; Macarion, the biſhop of Paris, ſaying that without thoſe words the baptiſm was null, and Stephen biſhop of Tournay that it was valid; thoſe words being neceſſary to the ſolemnity, tho' not to the ſubſtance of baptiſm. Some time after pope Alexander III decided according to the opinion of the biſhop of Paris, thoſe words being neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the intention of the miniſter from any other ablution.

There was in this period a violent diſpute among the Greeks, in which Emanuel Comnenus took a part very unbecoming an emperor, about the ſenſe in which it might be affirmed that an incarnate God was at the ſame time the *offerer* and the *oblation*. It was the occaſion of much diſcord and inconvenience to the empire, but how the

controverſy was decided does not appear. The Greeks were alſo divided into deplorable factions by the controverſy about the ſenſe in which Chriſt ſaid that the *Father was greater than the Son.* The emperor warmly intereſted himſelf in this queſtion; alſo publiſhing an explanation of the text, in which he maintained that the words related to *the fleſh that was hid in Chriſt, and that was paſſible,* or ſubject to ſuffering. He alſo publiſhed an edict denouncing capital puniſhments againſt ſuch as ſhould controvert his opinion. But the next emperor, Andronicus, forbad all diſputing on the ſubject. *Moſheim,* Vol. 2. p. 434.

About the year A. D. 1200 there aroſe a queſtion in the Greek church whether the euchariſtical elements, or the body of Chriſt, was corruptible, as before his paſſion, or incorruptible, as afterwards. This ſo much divided the people, that it was the ſubject of converſation in all places. Nicetas, who gives an account of this controverſy, does not ſay how it terminated; but he obſerves that the emperor took the right ſide, which, of courſe, was his own, viz. that it was incorruptible. So popular was this opinion, that they who held that the euchariſtical elements were ſubject to corruption, and conſequently to the proceſs of digeſtion, and its conſequences, were by way of opprobrium called *Stercorariſts.* At the council of

Sens,

Sens, in A. D. 1190, Rainold abbot of St. Martins of Nevers was accuſed as coming under this denomination, and alſo of maintaining, after Origen, that in the end all men will be ſaved.

In the pontificate of Clement III a queſtion aroſe whether the water mixed with the wine in the euchariſt was changed into the blood of Chriſt. Innocent III gave it as his opinion that it was. The water, he ſaid, is mixed with the wine, to repreſent the people united to Chriſt; but this obſervation ſeems to militate againſt his opinion. The firſt time that we find the word *tranſubſtantion* is in the letters of Hildebert archbiſhop of Tours in this period. He died in A. D. 1133.

Much of the refinement and nice diſtinctions in theology, ſpeculative and practical, came from the monks, who had leiſure for that purpoſe. Bernard, in treating of the love of God, ſays, "there are "four degrees of it, the firſt is for our own ſakes, "the ſecond from a principle of gratitude, the third "for the ſake of God, without reſpect to ourſelves, "and the fourth is the love of ourſelves only for "the ſake of God. The laſt" he ſays, "can only "be felt occaſionally here, but will be the fixed "ſtate of the bleſſed hereafter." Theſe diſtinctions the intelligent reader will perceive to be in ſome meaſure confirmed by the more accurate obſervations of Dr. Hartley.

As the laſt article under the title of this ſection, I would obſerve that pope Paſcall II, being at Florence in A. D. 1106, held a council, in which there was much diſputing with the biſhop of that city, who maintained that Antichriſt was then born. The novelty of the ſubject drew a great company, but nothing was determined about it.

SECTION X.

Of the State of the Jews in this Period.

AFTER the compoſition of the Chaldee paraphraſes, and the Talmud, which was completed about the year A. D. 500, the Jews produced not more than five or ſix books from the time of Chriſt to this period. But at this time they applied to literature in imitation of the Chriſtians, and Mahometans, and from this time they compoſed many works.

Their firſt author of note was Nathan, who began to diſtinguiſh himſelf in A. D. 1050, and died at Rome in A. D. 1106. He wrote a Dictionary, to explain the difficult words in the Talmud. After him came Abenezra, who wrote commentaries on the ſcriptures. He was a Spaniard, and

and died at Rhodes in A. D. 1174. At the ſame time lived in France Solomon Jarchi, who taught at Paris, and wrote commentaries on all the Bible and on the Talmud. He died in A. D. 1181.

But the moſt famous of all their writers was Maimonides, a native of Cordova, born in A. D. 1135. He was a diſciple of Averroes, who was alſo of Cordova, and one of the greateſt philoſophers among the Arabians. He wrote a commentary on the works of Ariſtotle, which having been tranſlated from Arabic into Latin, was afterwards uſed in the ſchools of Chriſtians. From Spain Maimonides went into Egypt, where he practiced medicine, and wrote many works, among which the moſt uſeful is ſtiled *More Nevochim*, in which he explains difficult paſſages of ſcripture. But the Jews in the Eaſt were offended at his writings, not bearing that the philoſophy of Ariſtotle ſhould be uſed to explain their religion. His principal opponent in the Weſt was Solomon of Montpellier; but his part was taken by other Jews, eſpecially at Narbonne. This occaſioned a kind of ſchiſm among the Jews, who excommunicated one another for forty years. The reputation of Maimonides was at length, however, univerſally eſtabliſhed among the Jews. He died in A. D. 1201. His principal defender was David Kimchi, a Spaniſh Jew, and a diſtinguiſhed grammarian.

The

The cruſades were always injurious to the Jews, the bigotted multitude wreaking their vengeance on them, as the enemies of Chriſtianity, no leſs than the Mahometans. Alſo the wealth that many of them had at this time acquired, eſpecially by uſury, was another incitement to plunder them. And even the moſt moderate among the Chriſtians were far from doing them proper juſtice. On the occaſion of the ſecond cruſade, in which many Jews were murdered in France and Germany, Peter, abbot of Clugni, exhorted the king of France to prevent their being put to death; but he adviſed him to puniſh them by the confiſcation of their goods, and making ſlaves of them, taking from them, he ſays, their unlawful gains, not only by uſury, but by purchaſing holy veſſels, of men who robbed the churches. Pope Innocent III, in his bull for the cruſade, forbad thoſe who took the croſs to pay uſury to the Jews, tho' in other reſpects he favoured them, and prohibited the ill uſage to which they had been expoſed.

About the year A. D. 1180 there were many reports of children being crucified by Jews, in various parts of France and England, and of miracles being wrought on the deaths of ſuch children, which excited a general hatred of the Jews. Philip Auguſtus king of France conceived the greateſt averſion to them. Such at that time were their repu-

reputation and number in Paris, that they were in poſſeſſion of near one half of the city, and in defiance of the laws they had Chriſtian ſlaves. They practiced uſury without bounds, and often had the ſacred veſſels of churches as pledges. On the repreſentation of this, the king diſcharged all Chriſtians from their obligation to pay any debt due to a Jew, keeping the fifth part for himſelf; and in April A. D. 1182, he publiſhed an edict, ordering all Jews to quit the kingdom; giving them, however, leave to ſell their effects, but confiſcating their houſes and lands. Accordingly, except ſome who were induced to make profeſſion of Chriſtianity, in July the ſame year they actually left the kingdom, with their wives, children, and all their dependants; and the year following the king converted their ſynagogues into Chriſtian churches. However in July A. D. 1198 he recalled the Jews.

In A. D. 1189 Richard king of England having given an order not to admit any Jews, or women, on a particular occaſion at court, it was reported that he had ordered them to be deſtroyed; and in conſequence of the miſtake many of them were put to death, in various parts of the kingdom. All the Jews in York, to the number of five hundred, periſhed. Being in a caſtle, ſurrounded day and night, and unable to defend themſelves, they killed one another, their wives, children, and domeſticks.

The

The few who remained were killed by the people, who plundered their houſes; and their papers being burned, the Chriſtians thought themſelves diſcharged from all the debts due to them.

In A. D. 1167 an Arabian perſuaded many Jews in Spain that he had orders from God to conduct them to the Meſſiah. Maimonides, being conſulted on the occaſion, adviſed them to pay no regard to him. He was, however, followed by great numbers. Being apprehended, he perſiſted in aſſerting his divine miſſion, and ſaid that if his head was cut off he ſhould immediately come to life again. He was beheaded, but without his coming to life, and the whole nation was ſeverely puniſhed for their credulity. *Pictet*, A. D. 1167.

A ſhort time after this a leprous Jew, being cured, believed that he was the Meſſiah, and gave himſelf out for ſuch to the Jews who lived beyond the Euphrates. This impoſtor having many followers gave occaſion to a new perſecution of that people, tho' they were ſoon undeceived with reſpect to him. Ib.

Benjamin, a Jew of Tudela in Spain, finiſhed his travels into the Eaſt A. D. 1173. His account contains ſo many improbable things, eſpecially with reſpect to the numbers that he found of his nation, and their flouriſhing circumſtances, that little dependance can be placed upon it.

SECTION

SECTION XI.

Miſcellaneous Articles.

1. THE knowledge of Chriſtianity was extended a little in the Northern parts of Europe in this period, and by ſuch means as had been employed for the ſame purpoſe before. In A. D. 1125 Otho, biſhop of Bamberg, was inſtrumental in converting the Pomeranians, the prince and the chiefs having been gained in the firſt place; ſo that the hiſtorian ſays, the converſion went on rapidly, eſpecially when the people were promiſed a diminution of their taxes. It deſerves to be noticed that, among the inſtructions given to theſe people relating to their new religion, they were forbidden to eat blood, or animals that had been ſtrangled; from which it appears that at this time, in Europe as well as in all other parts of the Chriſtian world, ſuch food was thought to be unlawful.

About the year A. D. 1150 Eric king of Sweden, accompanied by Henry biſhop of Upſal, made an expedition againſt the Finlanders, in order to convert them to Chriſtianity. After a victory obtained over them, the goſpel was preached to the reſt, when they were baptized, churches were ſettled in the country, and the biſhop remained with the

the new converts while the king returned to Sweden; but when the bishop would have compelled one of them to do penance, the man killed him.

In A. D. 1168 the inhabitants of the isle of Rugen, being conquered by Valdemar king of Denmark, consented to embrace Christianity. And when by the labours of Meinard, a canon of Sigeberg, many of the Livonians were converted to Christianity, about A. D. 1186, being made a bishop, he established his see in Rugen. Valdemar was greatly assisted in his labours to promote Christianity by Absalom bishop of London who acted at the same time in the capacities of archbishop, general, admiral, and prime minister. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2. p. 356.

The Sclavonians, who had always shewn the greatest aversion to Christianity, were at length brought over by the endeavours of the neighbouring princes. The most eminent preacher employed by them was Vicelinus, a native of Hamelen, who surpassed almost all his cotemporaries in piety and learning; and who, after having resided many years in a society of regular canons of St. Austin, at Falderen, was made bishop of Oldenburg. Ib. p. 349.

In this period a Nestorian priest, whose name was *John*, invaded and conquered a hord of Tartars, and as he was a presbyter before his elevation,

tion, he continued to be called *Presbyter*, or *Prester John*. Of this prince and his dominions the highest notions were entertained by the Christians in the West, from the letters which he wrote to the emperor Frederic, and also to Emanuel the Greek emperor. His son David commonly went by the name of his father. But he was conquered and deprived of his life and dominions by the famous Genghiscan. *Mosheim*, Vol. 2, p. 362.

2. In this period literature made a very considerable progress, many persons of distinguished abilities, and indefatigable in teaching and writing, having applied themselves to it; tho' what they chiefly insisted upon, we should not now think of much value. But it was a great thing to indulge any freedom of speculation, in such an age of high church authority; and the acuteness which was exercised on logic, metaphysics, and such theology as was made to accord with them, prepared the minds of men for making more accurate and more important distinctions in a later period.

In the beginning of the twelfth century Wm. de Champeaux, bishop of Chalons, and master of Abelard, obtained the title of *column of tutors*, tho' much inferior to his pupil, of whose success in teaching mention has been made already. But the most decisive proof of the attention that was paid to literature in this age, and of the reputation

acquired by it, is the hiſtory of Heloiſa, whoſe epiſtles written in latin are ſuperior to the other productions of that age, and worthy of any.

At the head of the ſchools was Peter Lombard, who was made biſhop of Paris in A. D. 1159. He compoſed a work called the *book of ſentences*, containing a ſyſtem of theology extracted from the Fathers; and it had the ſame ſucceſs with the work of Gratian with reſpect to the canon law. All the teachers of theology for ſeveral centuries afterwards uſed this book as a text, and two hundred and forty four authors wrote commentaries on it. Before this time it had been the cuſtom to explain all queſtions in theology by the philoſophy of Ariſtotle, which was thought to have led many perſons into errors, as Roſcellin, Abelard and Gilbert de Porée. St. Bernard was alſo a zealous oppoſer of the ſcholaſtics, who were alſo attacked by the modern myſtics, as well as the advocates for the old divinity. *Moſheim*, Vol. 1, p. 428.

Pope Alexander III, in a council held at Rome A. D. 1179, ordered the erecting new ſchools in the monaſteries and cathedral churches, and reſtoring to their primitive luſtre thoſe which, thro' the ſloth or ignorance of the monks or biſhops, had fallen into ruin. But ſuch was the celebrity of the ſchools eſtabliſhed at Salerno, Bologna, Paris, and Montpellier, that the epiſcopal and monaſtic ſchools

ſchools were deſerted, and ſunk into total oblivion. Ib. Vol. 2, p. 378.

The Arabic ſchools in Spain were alſo much frequented by chriſtians. Peter the abbot of Clugni travelled to Toledo, and tranſlated into latin the Koran, and the life of Mahomet. Ib. p. 385.

About the year A. D. 1176, Peter Comeſtor, a prieſt of Troyes, and afterwards chancellor of the church of Paris, publiſhed an eccleſiaſtical hiſtory from the creation to the time of the apoſtles, a work which, tho' very imperfect, and abounding with falſe interpretations of ſcripture, was for three hundred years conſidered as a body of poſitive theology, equal to the works of Gratian and Peter Lombard. Having for ſome time preſided in the ſchools of theology at Paris, he retired to St. Victor, and died in A. D. 1179.

In this period the ſtudy of the *civil law*, or the Roman jurisprudence, came into vogue, in conſequence of the diſcovery of a copy of Juſtinian's Pandects at Amalphi, when it was conquered by Roger king of Sicily, the emperor Lothaire, and the Piſans in conjunction. This was the beſt ſyſtem of the civil law, and being publiſhed by the order of Lothaire, it was publicly taught at Bologna and other places; and as all literature was in the hands of the clergy, and they found the general maxims of the civil law favourable to their

power, this ſyſtem was in a great meaſure adopted by moſt chriſtian ſtates, and taught in conjunction with the *canon law*. England was perhaps the only country, that had at any time been ſubject to the Romans, which retained its antient laws without any mixture of the civil.

3. A few particulars relating to the cuſtoms and diſcipline of the church in this period are deſerving of notice.

It appears by the letters of pope Paſcal II, that, in his time, young children were not only baptized, but received the communion; and it alſo appears by the writings of Hugh Victor, a famous teacher who died in A. D. 1142, that the euchariſt was given to them in both kinds, the wine being given to them by dipping the finger in it, and putting it into their mouths. But at a council held at London in A. D. 1175, it was forbidden to give the bread dipped in the wine, on the pretence of making the communion more complete; it having by this means become cuſtomary, at leaſt in ſome places, to give the bread only, that being the natural conſequence of the doctrine of this bread being the real body of Chriſt, which of courſe could not be deſtitute of blood.

Gui Paré, the pope's legate in Germany, being at Cologn in A. D, 1201, directed the people to proſtrate themſelves at the ſound of a bell during the

the elevation of the hoſt, and alſo that a bell ſhould be ſounded when it was carried in proceſſion, in order to warn the people to adore it; and in time theſe practices became univerſal; having been the natural conſequence of conſidering this hoſt as the ſame thing with Chriſt himſelf in perſons, and that perſon no leſs than God.

In this period the feſtival of the *conception of the Virgin Mary* was introduced by the people of Lyons. Bernard wrote to them to ſhew his diſapprobation of the novelty, at the ſame time that he approved of the feſtival of his *nativity* and *aſſumption*. She had the privilege, he ſaid, of living without ſin, but not that of being born without the taint of original ſin, which was peculiar to Chriſt.

The obſervance of Sunday, as a day of reſt from all labour, was gradually introduced among chriſtians, and required to be enforced by ſeveral orders of councils. Euſtache, a diſciple of Neuville, a famous itenerant preacher, authoriſed by the pope, came to England in this period, and preached at York; perſuading the people to have no fairs on ſundays, but to reſt from all ſervile work from noon on ſaturdays till ſun-riſe on Monday; but king John was offended at it, and ordered the markets to be kept on ſundays as before.

In this period interdicts had been much abuſed, and even found to be attended with many in-

conveniences, and in conſequence of it, in A. D. 1195, the pope recommended particular and not general interdicts; becauſe, as he ſaid, when there was no public worſhip, the heretics took advantage of it to ſeduce the people.

To give a better idea of the ſpirit of the religion that prevailed in this period, it may not be amiſs to mention the particulars of the penance appointed by pope Innocent III, for the murder of the biſhop of Virſburg in A. D. 1203, who was killed by two knights, his own vaſſals, named Boden and Henry. Being driven out of the country after having been excommunicated, they went and ſubmitted themſelves to the pope, who impoſed upon them the following penance. Never to appear in arms except againſt the Saracens or for ſelf defence, never to wear green (*petit gris*) or *ermine*, or any coloured cloth, never to attend at any public ſpectacle; not to marry again if they ſhould loſe their wives; to go as ſoon as poſſible to the holy land, to ſerve there four years againſt the Saracens, and in going thither to walk barefoot, and clothed in wool, like public penitents; to faſt on bread and water on wedneſdays and fridays, ember week, and vigils, to have three faſts, viz. before eaſter, whitſuntide, and chriſtmas, and never to eat fleſh but on thoſe feſtivals; to chaunt an hundred paternoſters, and make a hundred genuflexions every day; not

to

to receive the euchariſt but at the point of death? When they ſhould be beyond the ſea they ſhould faſt on wedneſdays and fridays, and the other days on which fleſh meat was allowed in Eaſter, and never eat fleſh but on ſundays and thurſdays. When they were in ſafety in any city in Germany, they ſhould go to the great church naked except in drawers, a halter about their necks, and rods in their hands, with which the canons ſhould give them diſcipline. If any perſon ſhould aſk the reaſon of it, they were to ſay, it was for the expiation of their crime. Being returned from beyond the ſea, they were to preſent themſelves to the pope to receive his farther orders. The letter which contains an account of this penance was dated the 18th of April, A. D. 1203.

4. Inſtances of groſs ſuperſtition may be expected in this period, the whole hiſtory exhibiting little elſe. I ſhall however, give a few of a particular kind. At a council at Beauvais in A. 1114, two brothers having been apprehended on a charge of hereſy, one of them confeſſed, but the other was tried by being thrown into the water; and not ſinking, he was judged to be guilty. The idea was that the devil, or ſome evil ſpirit being within them, they were thereby rendered ſpecifically lighter than water, and therefore could not ſink in it. At the ſame time two other perſons who came to ſee these

brothers were apprehended; and while the biſhops were deliberating on their caſe, the populace ruſhed into the priſon, and burned them alive without the city.

So great was the ſuperſtitious regard for relics, that they were carried from place to place, as an inſtrument of raiſing money. In order to raiſe a ſum to rebuild the cathedral church of Laon in France, the people carried not only about France but in England alſo, the relicks which had been ſaved when it had been burned down; and miracles being ſaid to be wrought by them, a great ſum was collected.

Of ſuperſtition leading to the commiſſion of crimes we had ſome remarkable inſtances in the preceding period. There occurs one no leſs ſo in this. As St. Laurence, biſhop of Dublin, was advancing to the altar in the church of Canterbury, at the time of ſolemn maſs in A. D. 1179, a man who was preſent, hearing that he was a ſaint, thought it would be meritorious to make him a martyr, like St. Thomas Becket; and with a great bludgeon he knocked him down. The prelate, however, recovered, and by his intreaty the pious aſſaſſin was ſpared.

Amidſt the lamentable ſuperſtition of theſe times, hurtful no doubt to good morals, we perceive the excellent ſtamina of chriſtianity in the queſtions

queſtions propoſed to dying perſons, and the anſwers expected to be made to them, ſuppoſed to be drawn by Anſelm. We find them in different forms in different authors, but much to the ſame purpoſe. One of the forms is as follows. Qu. Do you believe all the articles of the chriſtian faith? An. I believe them. Qu. do you rejoice that you die in the faith of a chriſtian? An. I do rejoice in it. Qu. Do you not acknowledge that you have offended God? An. I do, and am ſorry for it. Qu. Do you reſolve to abſtain from all mortal ſin for the future? An. By the help of God I do. Qu. Do you believe that you ſhall arrive at a ſtate of glory by the merits and paſſion of Jeſus Chriſt, and not by your own works? An. I do. *Pictet*, A. D. 1109.

5. Public tournaments, often ending in bloodſhed, were juſtly offenſive to the church. They were forbidden at a council at Rheims in A. D. 1131, as endangering both the body and the ſoul. They were alſo forbidden at the council of Lateran in A. D. 1139; but tho' theſe prohibitions were frequently repeated, they had no effect, the practice continuing four hundred years. At this laſt mentioned council, the uſe of croſs bows and alſo of long bows was forbidden againſt chriſtians and catholics, being probably deemed too deſtructive weapons.

6. At the ſame council thoſe who were then called *Brabancons* or *Routiers*, who ſerved any prince for pay, and were of different nations, tho' perhaps principally from Brabant, as their name ſeem to intimate, men who lived without any religion, were excommunicated; and orders were given that they ſhould not be abſolved till they had renounced their pernicious ſociety. It would have been happy if the terrors of ſuperſtition had always been employed for ſuch purpoſes as theſe.

7. The number of lepers was prodigiouſly increaſed in the Weſt, by means of the communication with the Eaſt in the cruſades. At the time of the council of Lateran in A. D. 1129, the lepers, as they could not attend public worſhip in company with other chriſtians, were allowed to have churches and prieſts of their own; and this is the firſt public act that we meet with concerning lepers.

Another effect of the cruſades was the union of the Maronites, who lived about mount Lebanon, and who had been Monothelites, to the latin church, by the patriarch of Antioch, in A. D. 1182. They were then ſaid to be about forty thouſand perſons.

9. It will be thought not a little extraordinary, but it was ſaid there were ſome *pagans* in Marſeilles ſo late as in the 13th century. *Lavals Hiſtory of the reformation in France*, Vol. 1. p. 412.

As

As a favourable ſpecimen of the literature and taſte, as well as the piety, of this period, I ſhall preſent my readers with a poem in latin rhyme, intitled *Oratio ad Dominum*, written by Hildebert biſhop of Mans, firſt publiſhed by archbiſhop Uſher, and copied into the *Annual Regiſter* for the year A. D. 1765.

Extra portam jam delatum,
Jam fœtentem, tumulatum,
Vitta ligat, lapis urget;
Sed ſi jubes hic reſurget.
Jube, lapis revolvetur,
Jube, vitta diſrumpetur.
Exiturus neſcit moras,
Poſtquam clamas, *Exi foras.*
In hoc ſalo mea ratis,
Infeſtatur a piratis,
Hinc aſſultus, inde fluctus,
Hinc et inde mors et luctus.
Sed tu, bone nauta, veni,
Preme ventos, mare leni;
Fac abſcedant hi piratæ,
Duc ad portum, ſalva rate.
Infæcunda mea ficus,
Cujus ramus ramus ficcus,
Incidetur, incendetur,
Si promulgas quod meretur.
Sed hoc anno dimittatur,

Stercoretur

Stercoretur, fodiatur,
Quod si necdum respondebit,
Flens hoc loquor, tunc ardebit.
Vetus hostis in me furit,
Aquis mersat, flammis urit.
Inde languens et afflictus,
Tibi soli sum relictus.
Ut hic hostis evanescat,
Ut infirmus convalescat,
Tu virtutem jejunandi,
Des infirmo, des orandi.
Per hæc duo, Christo teste,
Liberabor ab hac peste,
Ab hac peste solve mentem,
Fac devotum, pœnitentem.
Da timorem, quo projecto,
De salute nil conjecto.
Da spem, fidem, charitatem,
Da discretam pietatem.
Da contemptum terrenorum,
Appetitum supernorum.
Totum, Deus, in te spero.
Deus, ex te totum quæro.
Tu laus mea, meum bonum,
Mea cuncta tuum donum,
Tu solamen in labore,
Medicamen in languore.
Tu in luctu mea lyra,

Tu lenimen es in ira;
Tu in arcto liberator,
Tu in lapsu relevator.
Metum præstas in provectu,
Spem conservas in defectu,
Si quis lædit tu rependis,
Si minatur tu defendis.
Quod est anceps tu dissolvis.
Quod tegendum tu involvis.
Tu intrare me non sinas
Infernales officinas.
Ubi mæror, ubi metus,
Ubi fœtor, ubi fletus,
Ubi probra deteguntur,
Ubi rei confunduntur.
Ubi tortor semper cædens,
Ubi vermis semper edens,
Ubi totum hoc perenne,
Quia perpes mors Gehennæ.
Me receptet Sion illa,
Sion David, Urbs tranquilla;
Cujus faber auctor lucis,
Cujus portæ signum crucis.
Cujus claves lingua Petri,
Cujus cives semper læti.
Cujus muri lapis vivus,
Cujus custos rex festivus.
In hac urbe lux solennis,

Ver

Ver eternum, pax perennis ;
In hac odor implens cœlos,
In hac ſemper feſtum melos.
Non eſt ibi corruptela,
Non defectus, non querela ;
Non minuti, non deformes.
Omnes chriſto ſunt conformes.
Urbs cæleſtis, urbs beata,
Supra petram collocata.
Urbs in portu ſatis tuto,
De longinquo te ſaluto.
Te ſaluto, te ſuſpiro,
Te affecto, te requiro.
Quantum tui gratulentur,
Quam feſtive conviventur.
Quis affectus eos ſtringat,
Aut quæ gemma muros pingat,
Quis chalcedon, quis jacinctus,
Norunt illi qui ſunt intus.
In plateis hujus urbis,
Sociatus piis turbis,
Cum Moiſe, et Elia,
Pium cantem Alleluia.

PERIOD

PERIOD XIX.

FROM THE TAKING OF CONSTANTINOPLE BY THE LATINS IN A. D. 1204, TO THE TERMINATION OF THE CRUSADES IN A. D. 1291.

SECTION I.

The History of the Crusades continued.

THE taking of Constantinople from the Greek emperors, who had always been the secret or open enemies of the crusaders, was thought to be a decisive advantage to Rome, but eventually it proved to be the ruin of the whole scheme. It alarmed the Mahometan powers and united them, at the same time that it divided the Latin powers, by giving them too many objects; and among these the original one, which was the recovery of the holy land, (in which there was the most to be gained, and the least to be hazarded,) was neglected.

Pope

Pope Innocent III, tho' he had many objections to the conduct of the cruſaders, who had paid no regard to his ſtrict prohibitions not to moleſt any chriſtian prince, and eſpecially the Greek emperor, was in reality well pleaſed with their ſucceſs; and after ſome time thought proper to teſtify his approbation of it. In anſwer to a letter which the new emperor wrote to him on the occaſion, he congratulated him on the event, expreſſing his ardent wiſh that the union of the two churches might be promoted by it. With this view he inſiſted largely in his letter to the biſhops, on the chief articles of difference between them, viz. the proceſſion of the holy ſpirit. If, he obſerved, this was from the Father only, and not from the Son alſo, he would not have the ſame affection for the Son as for the Father, which would be inconſiſtent with the perfect equality of the divine perſons. He expreſſed his concern, however, to find that even the chriſtians in Paleſtine left that country, and went to Conſtantinople, after making a truce of ſix years with the Mahometans.

The Latins being now in poſſeſſion of Conſtantinople, a latin patriarch was choſen for that city, and the Greek patriarch retired to Thrace. But this was far from promoting any real union of the two churches. On the contrary, this conqueſt, and the behaviour of the conquerors, made the breach wider than before.

Aiemeri

Aimeri de Luſignan, king of Cyprus and Jeruſalem, dying in A. D. 1205, and Iſabella his widow, in whoſe right he had held the kingdom, dying A. D. 1210, her daughter Mary married John de Brienne, commonly called king of Acre, becauſe that was his place of reſidence, and his dominions did not extend much farther.

Satisfied with the conqueſt of Conſtantinople, it was ſome time before the chriſtians in the Weſt thought it neceſſary to ſend any forces into the Eaſt; but they were excited to it by the zeal of a great number of boys and ſome girls, who in A. D. 1212 took the croſs in France and Germany, but without any chief or plan of conduct. Many of them were confined by their parents, but others made their eſcape, and in purſuit of their object, wandering in the deſerts, periſhed miſerably. Some, however, paſſed the Alps, but the Lombards plundering them, they returned with ſhame to their reſpective homes.

The pope hearing of this, ſaid, "Thoſe chil-"dren reproach us. They run to the ſuccour of the holy land, while we are ſleeping;" and in A. D. 1213 he publiſhed a bull for the convocation of a general council, to meet in two years for the reformation of abuſes, and the ſuccour of the holy land. The ſame year he publiſhed another bull, which reſpected the cruſade only. In this he ſays,

"We hope that the power of Mahomet will soon "come to an end, since he is the beast in the Reve- "lation, whose number is six hundred and sixty six "years, and six hundred years are now nearly expi- "red, reckoning from the time of his appearance." As a farther motive to the expedition, he urged the critical situation of the christians in Palestine, and promised plenary indulgences to all who would undertake the expedition, with a discharge of all usury from Jews and others. He mentioned the forces that each of the princes, civil and ecclesiastical, should furnish, and promised to do in proportion himself. Farther, to unite them in this one object, he recalled the indulgences he had granted to those who served against the Saracens in Spain, or the heretics in Languedoc, except to the natives of those countries. He also excommunicated the pirates who obstructed the navigation of the Levant, and ordered processions every month, and prayers every day in the churches, to receive the alms that were designed for this object. In the last place, he wrote to Seiffeddin, the brother of Saladin, the sultan of Damascus and Babylon, to exhort him to give up the city of Jerusalem, and restore the captives on both sides, to prevent the further effusion of blood.

In consequence of this summons, the council met at the Lateran church in Rome in A. D. 1215, when

when orders were given for a new cruſade, to take place in A. D. 1217, when all who ſhould take the croſs were directed to meet at Brindiſi, or Meſſina, where he promiſed to attend in perſon. That there might be no obſtruction to this expedition, peace was ordered to be kept through all chriſtendom for four years. Notwithſtanding all this, only the king of Hungary, and Leopold duke of Auſtria, tho' accompanied by ſeveral biſhops and counts, and a multitude of common people, ſet out. At the ſame time, however, William count of Holland, and others from Germany, went by ſea to Portugal, when they took Alcazar from the Saracens, and ſpent the winter in Liſbon.

The arrival of the king of Hungary and the duke of Auſtria alarmed the Mahometan powers, but without any reaſon. For after a ſucceſsful expedition as far as the river Jordan, and returning loaded with booty, they divided into four parties; and the king of Hungary having ſpent three months in Paleſtine, and thereby accompliſhed his vow, returned to his own country.

The firſt who arrived the following year were the Germans from Portugal, who went to Damiata in Egypt, and laid ſiege to it. But the army was much divided betwen the pope's legate, who claimed the command, and the king of Jeruſalem, who joined them there. On the 29th of Auguſt A. D.

1219 they came to a battle with the Mahometans, and loſt ſix thouſand men, killed or taken priſoners. At length, however, they took the place on the 5th of November, after a ſiege of nine months. But after this they fell into great diſorder, living in the moſt licentious manner, without regarding even excommunications. Many left the army, and many even went over to the enemy. The king of Jeruſalem not agreeing with the legate, went to Acre, in A. D. 1220. The next year he returned, and at the earneſt requeſt of the legate, they marched towards Cairo; but being ſurrounded by the waters of the Nile, they were under the neceſſity of capitulating with the ſultan on condition of giving up Damiata, which they did November 8, A. D. 1221, after they had held it a year and ten months. For this they got nothing but what was ſuppoſed to be the true croſs, which Saladin had carried from Jeruſalem, the chriſtian captives, and a ſafe conduct to Acre; agreeing on a truce for eight months. But ſo much was the ſultan irritated by this invaſion of his territories, that, recovering the poſſeſſion of Damiata, he demoliſhed the chriſtian churches, and greatly inſulted and oppreſſed the chriſtians in his dominions.

In A. D. 1223 the king of Jeruſalem was in England, to get ſuccours for the holy land, and thence he went to France; but he complained that he

he met with little encouragement, and the preachers of this crusade were even ridiculed in Germany and other places, the publishers being persons of no consideration; and, as the emperor Henry observed to the pope, having but little power of granting indulgences. He, therefore, urged his holiness to remedy this inconvenience, and to remove every other obstacle to the expedition, on which he was much intent, having promised to marry the daughter of the king of Jerusalem.

In return, the pope sent cardinal Conrad as his legate into Germany in June A. D. 1224, with ample powers, and also preachers, for the purpose of publishing sufficient indulgences. In consequence of this great numbers of persons from all parts of Germany took the cross; but it was not till August A. D. 1227 that Frederic arrived at Brindisi, where the army of the crusaders was assembled; and there being a great mortality in it, and the emperor himself being ill, the expedition was put off for that year. Pope Gregory, however, thinking his illness to be a feint, excommunicated him for not having kept his word. The non arrival of the emperor was a great disappointment to those who were in Palestine, and more than forty thousand pilgrims, who were already there, returned in the vessels that had carried them.

The emperor paid no regard to the pope's excommunication, tho it was ſolemnly repeated, but had divine ſervice performed in his preſence, and he celebrated Eaſter as uſual. In June A. D. 1228 he actually embarked, tho' expreſsly forbidden to proceed till he ſhould be abſolved from the cenſure which he had incurred, and he arrived ſafe in Paleſtine. During this abſence of the emperor, and while he was engaged in a war which the pope pretended to have much at heart, he employed John de Brienne the late king of Jeruſalem to oppoſe Rainald duke of Spoleto, the emperor's general in the ſouth of Italy, and other commanders to attack his dominions in the north; and as Rainald employed many Saracens, the emperor's ſubjects in Sicily, who ſpared nothing belonging to the churches, much deveſtation was committed on both ſides.

The emperor himſelf being arrived at Acre, September 7 A. D. 1220, was received as a perſon in a ſtate of excommunication. However, by a treaty which he made with the ſultan of Egypt, he procured the poſſeſsion of Jeruſalem for ten years, and he himſelf went thither to perform his devotions, notwithſtanding the place was laid under an interdict on his account; and there being no biſhop to give him the crown, he took it from the altar. So much were the Templars and Hoſpitallers

tallers his enemies, that when he deſigned to viſit the river Jordan with a few attendants, they gave the ſultan notice of it; but he, deteſting their perfidy, ſent their letter to the emperor. This oppoſition to him both in Paleſtine and Italy haſtened his return, and accordingly he left the country May 1ſt, A. D. 1229.

Being arrived in Italy, he ſoon recovered the places which the pope had taken from him. So far, however, was this prelate from being diſcouraged, that he proceeded farther to abſolve the emperor's ſubjects from their oath of allegiance to him; ſaying that "no perſon ought to keep faith with thoſe "who oppoſed God and his ſaints, and who tram-"pled upon his commandments." This was Auguſt 20. At length the emperor made his peace with the pope, ſwearing to ſubmit to the orders of the church, without any condition, and on the 28th of that month he was abſolved from his excommunication; and on the firſt of September following they met, at the pope's invitation, at Anagni where they ſat at the ſame table, and had a long converſation, in the preſence of the maſter of the Teutonic order.

In A. D. 1234 Gregory IX publiſhed a new cruſade, repeating the bull of pope Innocent III, and renewing his excommunication of thoſe who furniſhed arms or ſhips to the infidels. The Do-

minicans and Franciſcans were employed to preach it, and to collect money for it. But tho' great ſums were thereby raiſed, the people ſeeing no good uſe made of it, their zeal in the cauſe, ſays Matthew Paris, was much cooled, and the buſineſs proceeded very ſlowly.

Many who had taken the croſs being aſſembled at Lyons in A. D. 1229, the pope, perceiving the diſtreſſed ſituation of the Latin emperor of Conſtantinople, urged them to go to his aſſiſtance. Afterwards, however, he ſent a nuncio to forbid them to proceed; and the emperor alſo deſiring them to wait for him, they were thrown into great confuſion, and diſperſed in different directions, a few only going to Paleſtine. Richard, earl of Cornwall, arriving at Acre October 8, A. D. 1240, was received with great joy, the affairs of the chriſtians being then in great diſorder; the princes who had arrived before him having acted independently of one another, and ſome of them having been defeated. Advancing to Jaffa he made an advantageous truce with the Mahometans, they giving up ſeveral places which the chriſtians were allowed to fortify. This treaty was ſigned at the end of November A. D. 1240.

In A. D. 1244 the chriſtians of Paleſtine were threatened with a new enemy, one of the Tartar princes, driven from Karaſm by Jenghis Khan; when

when the chriſtians in Jeruſalem, finding themſelves two weak to defend the place, left it, in order to join their brethren in other places, to the number of more than ſix thouſand. But a party of Saracens with whom they had made a truce falling upon them, killed ſome, and ſold the reſt for ſlaves. The Karaſmians fell upon ſome who had eſcaped, ſo that ſcarce three hundred were left. The prince entering Jeruſalem, found it almoſt deſerted, and going into the church of the holy ſepulchre, he cruelly butchered thoſe who had taken refuge in it, and abuſed the place in a ſhocking manner. After this the chriſtians joining their forces with thoſe of two Mahometan princes attacked the Karaſmians, the 10th of October A. D. 1244, but were defeated, ſo that of the military orders there remained only thirty three Templars, twenty ſix Hoſpitallers, and three Teutonic knights, the greater part having been killed or taken. So much of the country was ſeized, by theſe Karaſmians, that only a few fortreſſes were left to the chriſtians; and it was with much difficulty that they were able to defend them.

Notwithſtanding this unpromiſing aſpect of things, the greateſt expectations of the pope and of all the chriſtian world were raiſed by the pious king Lewis IX of France taking the croſs; and tho' he did it when he was ill, and his life was deſpaired of,

he solemnly renewed his vows after his recovery; and against the most pressing remonstrances of his mother and all his nobility, who thought his presence necessary at home, he persisted in his purpose. Accordingly on the 28th of June, A. D. 1248, he embarked, and landing at Cyprus on the 17th of September, was gladly received by Henry de Lusignan the king of that Island, to whom also the pope had given the kingdom of Jerusalem, vacant in his idea by his deposition of the emperor Frederick, and his son Conrad; and who, with all his nobility, joined him in the expedition. On the 13th of May they sailed, and arrived at Damiata the 4th of June A. D. 1249, and the place being abandoned by the enemy, they took immediate possession of it. On the 20th of November they marched with a view to attack Cairo, but after some success, they suffered so much through illness and want of provisions, that they began to return. This, however, they were prevented from doing. For being completely surrounded by the enemy, the whole army was killed or taken prisoners, and among the latter was the king himself. He obtained his liberty by giving up Damiata, all his prisoners, and eight hundred thousand besants of silver. He also made a truce for ten years, but going to Acre, and the Mahometans not observing the terms of the treaty with respect to the prisoners,

he

he continued there, fortifying ſeveral places, and redeeming captives at a great expence. At length, without attempting any thing farther he ſailed for France the 24th of April A. D. 1254, and arrived there the 11th of July.

This unſucceſsful expedition was only the beginning of misfortunes. The wars between the Piſans and the Genoeſe, (the former aſſiſted by the Venetians,) was nearly fatal to the intereſt of the chriſtians in Paleſtine, they fighting with one another on the very coaſt. The Templars, alſo and the Hoſpitallers quarrelled, and actually fought at Acre, and the former being defeated, hardly one of their knights remained. The greater part of the Hoſpitallers periſhed in the action.

But the greateſt diſaſter, as it was then conſidered, was the loſs of Conſtantinople. The Latin emperor Baldwin being reduced to a ſtate of great weakneſs, and his troops being abſent on an expedition, the Greek emperor Michael Paleologus ordered his ſon Alexis to march near the walls of Conſtantinople, and alarm the place. But he, perceiving the defenceleſs ſtate of the city, took it by ſurprize in the night of the 25th of July A. D. 1261, after the Latins had held it fifty ſeven years. Baldwin himſelf made his eſcape.

They had farther loſſes in Paleſtine itſelf. For in A. D. 1264 the ſultan of Egypt took Cæſarea.

The

The next year he took the caſtle of Aſouf, and even prepared to beſiege Acre, which was the principal place the cruſaders then held; and the year after this he took the caſtle of Saphet.

The hopes of the chriſtian world were, however, revived by Lewis taking the croſs a ſecond time, which, after much pious preparation, he did with great ſolemnity, and on the 1ſt of July A. D. 1270 he ſet ſail in Genoeſe veſſels with a great number of his lords, and other perſons of leſs note. Among them was the king of Navarre, his ſon-in-law, the count of Poitou, his brother the count of Flanders, and John the eldeſt ſon of the count of Bretagne. After ſuffering much by a ſtorm, and rendezvouſing at Cagliari in Sardinia, they proceeded to Tunis, in hopes that the king of it would declare for them, and become a chriſtian, of which they had been led to form ſome expectation, or elſe to take the place. In both, however, they were diſappointed; and a violent diſorder ſeizing the army, many died, and at length the king himſelf, on the 25th of Auguſt. He made his exit with all the piety of the age, being laid on a bed covered with cinders, and after giving excellent inſtructions to his ſon, but among them was a ſtrict charge to extirpate hereſy. Judging by the maxims of the times, and this prince's real diſpoſition, no perſon appears to have better deſerved the title of *Saint*, which he obtained.

Charles

Charles king of Sicily arrived at the place juſt before the king expired; but all that could now be done, was to make a truce with the king of Tunis for ten years; and they did it on the following advantageous terms. He was to pay the expences of the armament, to make Tunis a free port, to pay an annual tribute to the king of Sicily, to ſet at liberty all his chriſtian captives, and to allow the free exerciſe of the chriſtian religion, without exacting the uſual tribute. After the treaty was ſigned, arrived Edward eldeſt ſon of the king of England, with his brother Edmond, and many of the Engliſh nobility. He was much diſſatisfied with the treaty, but went with the army to Sicily, and there paſſed the winter; but the new king of France returned to his own country.

Edward, having left Sicily in the ſpring of A. D. 1271, arrived at Acre the 9th of May, with a thouſand choſen men, but he found the affairs of the chriſtians in a very declining way. The ſultan of Egypt had made great progreſs, having taken Jaffa by treachery during a truce, the caſtle of Beaufort, and the city of Antioch, where he put to death ſeventeen thouſand perſons, and carried away more than one hundred thouſand into ſlavery, which ſo ruined the place that it never after recovered itſelf. On the 8th of April he took the caſtle of Acre which belonged to the Hoſpitallers.

He

He then made a truce with the count of Tripoli, took Montfort, which belonged to the Germans, and having laid it in ruins, advanced to the ſiege of Acre. Here, however, his progreſs was ſtopped by the arrival of Edward, who after reſting a month marched with ſeven thouſand men, and took Nazareth, killing all that he found there. He made ſeveral other expeditions in the courſe of a year, and half that time he continued in Paleſtine, but without any conſiderable effect.

At this time Thibaud, arch deacon of Liege, was in Paleſtine, and being raiſed to the papal dignity while he was there, by the name of Gregory X, he made it his great object to promote the cruſade, and he engaged the maritime powers of Piſa, Genoa, Marſeilles, and Venice, to aſſiſt in it, by ſending immediate relief till he could procure more effectual aſſiſtance by means of a general council which he called to meet the 1ſt of May A. D. 1274.

In the mean time he gave the title of patriarch of Jeruſalem to Thomas of Leontine in Sicily, a Dominican friar, who had been biſhop of Bethany, that he might attend to the ſpiritual affairs of the cruſade, which according to the repreſentation of Gregory, who muſt have known it, was indeed deplorable. Writing to him on the occaſion, he ſays, "You yourſelf know the enormous crimes "that are committed there, and that the wretched "ſlaves

" ſlaves of voluptuouſneſs have drawn the anger of " God upon Antioch, and ſo many other places, " which the enemy has deſtroyed. It is aſtoniſhing " that our brethren ſhould be ſo little affected by " ſuch examples, that they continue in the ſame " diſorders without repentance, till they themſelves " periſh.

This patriarch arrived at Acre with five hundred men, in the pay of the pope; but in the mean time Edward was very near loſing his life, by an aſſaſſin ſent by a Mahometan emir, who had often brought him letters, pretending a willingneſs to become a chriſtian. At length, after waiting in vain for ſuccours, either from the chriſtian powers, or the Tartars who had promiſed to join the chriſtians, he made a truce with the ſultan of Egypt for ten years, and left Acre the 22d, of September A. D. 1272, leaving the troops that were in his pay. Thus terminated another great effort to reſtore the affairs of the chriſtians in the Eaſt.

The great object of the general council of Lyons, which met in A. D. 1275, was the relief of the holy land, and many orders were given reſpecting it by Gregory X, who certainly had the cauſe much at heart; but all the preparations for it terminated in nothing. The principal obſtruction aroſe from the wars in which the chriſtian powers in Europe were mutually engaged, and eſpecially

pecially that between Peter of Arragon and Charles of Sicily, whom the pope favoured ſo much, that he granted him part of the tenths of the eccleſiaſtical revenues deſtined for carrying on the holy war.

After a conſiderable interval, an attempt was made to aſſiſt the chriſtians in the Eaſt by Henry II king of Cyprus; who being in poſſeſſion of what remained of the kingdom of Jeruſalem, came to Acre in A. D. 1286 with a fine army. The lieutenant whom Charles king of Sicily (and who likewiſe claimed the kingdom) had left there was obliged to depart, and Henry was crowned at Tyre Auguſt 15 the ſame year.

In A. D. 1288 the ſultan of Egypt took Tripoli, and burned it; but Henry made a truce with him, and returned to Cyprus, leaving his brother Aimeri to guard the city; and applying to the pope, he ſent him twenty gallies with every thing neceſſary to ſerve for one year. But when they arrived at Acre, ſo many of the crew went on ſhore, that only thirteen of them could be armed, and the city not being attacked, as was expected, they were of little uſe.

In the beginning of the year following pope Nicoles IV publiſhed a new bull to promote the the cruſade, with plenary indulgences as uſual. At the ſame time he directed the patriarch to eſtabliſh

tabliſh inquiſitors in all the places ſubject to him, taking the aſſiſtance of the Dominicans. For the diſorders occaſioned by the war had given impunity to heretics and Jews in that part of the world.

After the loſs of Antioch, Tripoli, and other places which the Chriſtians held in Paleſtine, the city of Acre, to which they were now in a manner reduced, was much ſtrengthened. The king of Jeruſalem, the prince of Antioch, the counts of Tyre and Tripoli, the Templars, Hoſpitallers, the pope's legate, and the troops kept by the kings of France and England, all reſided there; and they were not long without finding occaſion for action. Notwithſtanding the truce which king Richard had made with the ſultan of Egypt, about ſixteen hundred men, who had been ſent by the pope, pretending that they were not bound by it, plundered and killed thoſe Mahometans, who on the faith of that treaty brought proviſions and merchandiſe to Acre. They alſo made excurſions to the neighbouring villages, and plundered and killed the inhabitants. The ſultan Kelaoun Elaſar, not being able to obtain any ſatisfaction for thoſe outrages, advanced againſt the place with a great army in October A. D. 1290; and tho' he died on the march, his ſon Kalib began the ſiege on the 5th of April A. D. 1291, with an army of one hundred

and ſixty thouſand foot and ſixty thouſand horſe, and on the 18th of the ſame month he took it by aſſault.

The king fled in the night, and three thouſand with him, the patriarch was drowned by overloading the chaloup in which he was going to a ſhip, and the maſter of the temple, who had the command, died fighting. The Mahometans made a dreadful ſlaughter of moſt that they found in the place, and carried the reſt captive, in number, it was ſaid, ſixty thouſand. Immenſe wealth was found in the place, as every thing of value had been brought thither from other places, and it had long been the centre of all the commerce of the Levant. The enemy, having carried away every thing of value, ſet fire to the city, and totally demoliſhed it.

This event was at that time conſidered as a juſt puniſhment for the wickedneſs of the inhabitants, who are ſaid to have been the moſt corrupt of all Chriſtians, eſpecially with reſpect to impurity, both of men and women. The ſame day that Acre was taken the inhabitants of Tyre abandoned that place, and ſaved themſelves by ſea, and thoſe of Barut ſurrendered without making any reſiſtance. Thus the Latins loſt all that they had hitherto kept of the country; the greater part of thoſe who were ſaved retiring to Cyprus.

Such

Such was the termination of the war for the recovery of the holy land, after it had laſted near two hundred years.

Pope Nicolas, on receiving the afflicting news, made every poſſible effort to recover what had been loſt; and for this purpoſe appointed a new cruſade to take place two years after. In this he publiſhed bulls, in which he moſt pathetically lamented the ſad diſaſter, and earneſtly exhorted all Chriſtians to repair the loſs. With this view he wrote to all the princes from whom he had any expectations, and eſpecially to the ſtates of Venice and Genoa, whom he exhorted to make peace for this end. But in every country there was ſome particular obſtruction that retarded the buſineſs, ſo that nothing was done; and the death of Nicolas the 4th of April A. D. 1292 put an end to every project of the kind.

SECTION II.

Of the papal Power, and the Oppoſition that was made to it in this Period.

IN no period of this hiſtory were the claims of the popes more exorbitant than in this, nor did they ever make a more intemperate uſe of their excommunications and interdicts; and yet in

none had they leſs effect, except when the temporal intereſt of the ſecular princes induced them to favour their pretenſions.

The authority of the antient canons was in a great meaſure ſet aſide in this period by the collection of *Roman decretals*, begun by Innocent III, who employed Petro Benevento his notary in the work, and who finiſhed it in A. D. 1210. This was the firſt collection of *Jus Pontificium* made by authority. Additions were afterwards made to it; But Gregory XI ordered a new code to be made, leaving out all the old regulations that were not to his purpoſe, and adding many others of his own. In this work he employed Raimond de Pennaforte a Dominican. This collection Gregory ordered to be alone made uſe of both in ſchools and in courts of juſtice. Accordingly the profeſſors of law taught it, and wrote many commentaries upon it. Boniface VIII made a new collection in A. D. 1299, but this was not much regarded in France. *Giannone*, Vol. 2. p. 49.

According to the now eſtabliſhed maxims of the court of Rome, the popes were univerſal ſovereigns, in temporals as well as ſpirituals. When Honorius III was applied to in A. D. 1222 for his permiſſion to ſuffer the Greeks to live in ſubjection to their own biſhop, he would not allow it; ſaying that "two biſhops in one city was a "monſter,

"monſter, and that the Greeks ſhould ſubmit to "be governed by the Latins." By this means the power of the pope would be paramount thro' all the Chriſtian world. Gregory IX, writing to the queen of Georgia, inſiſted largely on the neceſſity of acknowledging "one church under one "head;" ſaying that, "to Peter only was given "the care of his flock, and the keys of heaven, but "that St. Peter and his ſucceſſors had called his "brethren, the other biſhops, to partake with him "in his cares;" as if all other biſhops had derived their power from the pope, which, indeed, was the avowed opinion of ſome divines of this age.

Alexander Hales, a celebrated divine, who died in A. D. 1244, maintained in his writings that ſpiritual authority was ſuperior to temporal in dignity, antiquity, and the benediction which was beſtowed upon it; that the ſpiritual power inſtituted the temporal, and is the judge of it, and that the pope can be judged by God only. He farther advanced, that the powers of all inferior prelates are derived from him, he being the head, and they the members. Thomas Aquinas, who was unqueſtionably the greateſt writer of the age, and whoſe authority was the higheſt, maintained that the pope can change whatever may be decreed in councils with reſpect to poſitive law, and according to occaſions; that the fathers aſſembled in

council can do nothing without the pope, and that without him they have not even a power of aſſembling in council at all. Theſe maxims, Fleury ſays, were new, and the laſt of them taken from the ſpurious decretals. Vol. 17. p. 560.

The popes were not backward to act on ſuch maxims as theſe. Innocent III, when he called the general council at Lyons in A. D. 1245, in his letters to the biſhops, only aſked their advice, and did not conſider them as judges along with him. When Otho, the pope's legate in England in A. D. 1237, held a council in London, the biſhops deſired to examine the decrees that he ſaid he had to paſs before he himſelf attended, that they might ſee whether they contained any thing to their prejudice; which ſhews that thoſe legates not only brought draughts of decrees ready drawn up at Rome, but that it was not thought decent even to diſcuſs them in their preſence.

The popes paid as little regard to their own decrees as to any others, when it was convenient for them to have them reverſed. When John XXI, being deſirous to promote the cruſade, ſent his legate to make peace between the kings of France and Caſtile, he directed him to employ, if neceſſary, excommunications and interdicts, notwithſtanding any privilege that particular perſons or places might have not to be expoſed to ſuch cenſures; which

which ſhewed the inſignificance of thoſe privileges, tho' granted by the popes, ſince they violated them at their own pleaſure.

What was ordered by one pope, even in a general council, was not always regarded by another. At the great council in Lyons in A. D. 1274, regulations were made about the meeting of the cardinals to chuſe a pope, the object of which was to prevent any cabals, and accelerate elections, which had been much retarded before. But when Honorius IV was made pope in A. D. 1285, he obſerved in his circular letter, that he had been choſen without any uncertainty, the cardinals not having been ſhut up for the purpoſe; which he ſaid had by a condemnable abuſe been practiced in vacancies of the church of Rome, ſo that the former conſtitution was at that time much diſliked, and diſregarded.

In this period, as in the preceding, the popes exerciſed the right of confirming titles of royalty. In A. D. 1204, Innocent III gave the dignity of *king* to Primiſlas, duke of Bohemia, on his taking the part of Otho againſt Philip of Suabia. Princes themſelves were too ready to acknowledge this power in the popes, without conſidering that they were liable to ſuffer in conſequence of it. Peter II king of Arragon voluntarily went to Rome to receive his crown from the hands of Innocent III,

promiſing that he and his kingdom would always be faithful to him, and engaging to pay every year two hundred and fifty pieces of gold. His people, however, were much diſpleaſed with his making their kingdom tributary, which before was free.

That the popes, having this immenſe power, ſhould not hitherto have made any uſe of it to aggrandize their over families is rather extraordinary, conſidering how common it came to be afterwards. Nicolas III, who was made pope in A. D. 1277, is ſaid to have been the firſt who did this. In a ſhort time he made his relations the richeſt of all the Romans, in lands, caſtles, and money.

There is always a point beyond which oppreſſion will not be borne. In A. D. 1225 Honorius III made a demand of two prebends in all cathedral and conventual churches, both in France and England, on the pretence of removing the complaints that were then made of the avarice and exactions of the court of Rome; which he ſaid were only occaſioned by its poverty, which this grant would remedy. It did not, however, ſucceed in either of the countries.

The firſt and the ſteadieſt oppoſers of the exorbitant demands of the popes were ſome of the clergy in the diſtant parts of chriſtendom, where the princes were more independent of them. In this period two Engliſh prelates diſtinguiſhed themſelves

ſelves in this way, Sewald archbiſhop of York, and Robert Groſthed biſhop of Lincoln. Sewald was excommunicated by Alexander IV, becauſe he would not admit Italians of his arbitrary nomination to livings in his gift; but, as the hiſtorian ſays, the more maledictions were pronounced againſt him from without, the more benedictions he had from the people. On his death bed in A. D. 1258 he made a ſolemn appeal to Chriſt, againſt the unjuſt ſentence of the pope, for not admitting unworthy perſons, and who knew nothing of the Engliſh language, to the government of churches committed to his care, and he ſummoned his holineſs to that higher tribunal. He even wrote ſtrong letters of remonſtrance to the pope himſelf on the ſubject; but the haughty prelate only expreſſed the greater contempt and indignation, as he did for Groſthed.

This prelate, a perſon of the greateſt eminence for literature and piety of the age in which he lived, having received an order from the pope which he did not approve, refuſed to obey it; becauſe it contained the clauſe *non obſtante*, which, he ſaid, would overturn all the bonds of human ſociety, even the decrees of his predeceſſors, and give an example for violating his own. This, he ſaid, was a manifeſt abuſe of the papal power; that ſuch orders ought not to be obeyed, tho' they came

from the angels, but ought to be reſiſted by force. Innocent IV was highly provoked at his conduct, but was adviſed to paſs it over for fear of the conſequences it might have; and the more, ſays Matthew Paris, "as a revolt will ſome day come," as if he had foreſeen that the yoke of popery would one day be thrown off.

When Groſthed was on his death bed in A. D. 1250, diſcourſing with ſome of his clergy of the deſtruction of ſouls by the avarice of the court of Rome, he ſaid, "Jeſus Chriſt "came to ſave ſouls, and therefore he that "deſtroys them deſerves the name of Antichriſt. "Other popes," he ſaid, "had afflicted the church, "but this more than any of them, by means of the "uſurers he introduced into England, men," he "ſaid, "worſe than Jews. He orders the friars to "attend upon perſons in dying circumſtances, to "perſuade them to make bequeſts to the holy land, "and thereby defraud their natural heirs. He "ſells croſſes to laymen, as they formerly ſold "ſheep and oxen in the temple, and he propor-"tions his indulgences according to the money "which is given for the cruſade." After enumerating many other abuſes, he ſaid that, "in order to "ſecure them he gives the kings a part of the revenues "he draws from their dominions, and that the men-"dicant friars ſerved him as legates in diſguiſe."

The

The incroachments of the court of Rome on the Engliſh in the reign of that weak prince Henry III were greater than the people could bear; almoſt all the church livings being then given to Italians, whoſe only object was to raiſe all the money they could, ſo that no care was taken of the pariſhes, there was no hoſpitality, nothing given to the poor, no care of the ornaments of churches, or even proviſion for repairs. The popes, not content with the tax of Peter pence, levied contributions on the clergy without the king's conſent, and by the uſe of the clauſe *non obſtante* in their bulls, ſet aſide all antient cuſtoms, contracts, ſtatutes, privileges, and rights, of every kind.

In this ſtate of things letters were ſent in A. D. 1231 by unknown perſons, to particular biſhops and chapters, as from thoſe who choſe to die rather than be oppreſſed by the Romans, adviſing them to take no part in favour of them, or they ſhould be treated in the ſame manner themſelves, and have their property deſtroyed. Other letters were ſent to thoſe who received the rents of thoſe foreigners, forbidding to pay them on the ſame penalty. And about Chriſtmas in this year a more open conſpiracy againſt all the Italians broke out. A number of men with their faces covered plundered the granaries of a church belonging to a rich Roman, and ſelling the greateſt part

part of the corn at a moderate price, gave the reſt to the poor. Some knights being ſent by the earl to put a ſtop to theſe proceedings, they produced letters, as from the king, forbidding any perſons to moleſt them, ſo that in a fortnight theſe unknown perſons ſold every thing, and retired with the money.

Roger biſhop of London, hearing of this, excommunicated all who were concerned in the buſineſs; but notwithſtanding this, the ſame violences were renewed at Eaſter, and were extended thro' all England, while the Romiſh clergy kept themſelves concealed in monaſteries, and durſt not complain, chuſing to loſe their property rather than their lives.

It appeared afterwards that the authors of theſe violences were about eighty men, headed by Robert de Thinge. The pope hearing of them wrote to the king to reproach him for not putting a ſtop to the diſorder, and ordering him, under pain of excommunication and an interdict, to make diligent inquiry into it, and puniſh the authors of it. In another letter to the archbiſhop of York, and other biſhops, he complained of a medal of St. Peter having been trampled upon, that one of his officers had been torn in pieces, and another left half dead. On this, inquiry being made, there were found among the guilty perſons, or their accomplices, even biſhops, the king's chaplains, arch-

archdeacons, and deans, beſides a great number of knights and other laymen. Alſo the grand juſticiary Hubert appeared to have been the perſon who had ſent letters, as from the king, to forbid any violence to be offered to thoſe who plundered the goods of the Italian clergy. Robert de Thinge came forward with twenty other perſons, and declared to the king, that what he had done was out of hatred to the Romans, who had by a manifeſt fraud deprived him of the only benefice that he had, and that rather than loſe it, he choſe to live under excommunication for a time. The pope's commiſſaries adviſing him to go to Rome in order to get abſolved, he went, and the king himſelf gave him letters of recommendation.

Nothing effectual being done for the relief of the kingdom, but, on the other hand, the exactions of the court of Rome continually increaſing, the king called a parliament in A. D. 1246, in which the cauſes of complaint were conſidered, and an account of them taken under diſtinct heads, and ſent to the pope. After enumerating their grievances, they ſaid that, unleſs they were redreſſed, the conſequence would be a riſing of the people againſt the king, whoſe duty it was to protect them, even againſt the church of Rome. On this remonſtrance ſome mitigation of the evils was obtained; but this was owing to nothing but the im-

impoſſibility of continuing them. Still the pope claimed the eſtates of thoſe of the clergy who died inteſtate; but the king had the ſpirit to forbid the payment, and alſo the levying of taxes on the clergy for the benefit of the pope. At this his holineſs was much enraged; and hearing that the weak king was giving way, he afterwards demanded one third of the incomes of thoſe who reſided on their livings, and one half of thoſe who did not reſide. However, both the clergy and the king oppoſed this daring impoſition.

Scotland took warning by the example of England. Otho the pope's legate in the time of Henry III would have proceeded to that country, but Alexander then king of Scotland informed him, that there never had been any legate in Scotland in the time of his anceſtors, and that he would not ſuffer it now; and that if he inſiſted upon going thither he would not be anſwerable for his ſafety: for that it was not in his power to reſtrain his turbulent ſubjects. On this the legate refrained from proceeding any farther.

The ſame legate met with the ſame oppoſition in Germany. For when he propoſed to hold a council at Virſburgh in A. D. 1231, Albert duke of Saxony wrote in the name of all the nobles to the prelates, remonſtrating againſt the uſurpations of the court of Rome, adviſing them to preſerve the cuſtoms

cuſtoms of their anceſtors, and to guard againſt the incroachments of ſtrangers, eſpecially as they were not only biſhops, but princes. This had ſuch an effect that the legate did not hold his council.

Even the pious Lewis IX of France laid ſome reſtraint on the papal exactions by his ordonance called *the Pragmatic ſanction* in A. D. 1268; when, intending to make a ſecond expedition to the holy land, after providing for the freedom of elections to all church livings, both with reſpect to the pope and the lay lords, and guarding againſt ſimony, he ſays, "We will not that the pecuniary exacti-"ons, and heavy charges, which the court of Rome "has impoſed, or may impoſe, upon the churches "of our kingdom, and by which it is miſerably "impoveriſhed, be levied or collected."

Theſe oppreſſions were ſeverely felt by the lower orders of people, notwithſtanding their general ignorance and ſervility. In A. D. 1251 there appeared a Hungarian of the name of Jacob, who collected a great number of the lower people, and armed them, on the pretence of delivering the holy land without the aſſiſtance of the nobility. In his progreſs he declaimed with great vehemence againſt the court of Rome and the clergy, and was received with joy by the common people. The queen of France at firſt favoured them, thinking they might be inſtrumental in delivering her ſon, then

then a priſoner; but at length committing great diſorders wherever they came, the country was armed againſt them; in conſequence of which their chief was killed, and his followers, who had been an hundred thouſand, were diſperſed.

The behaviour of the Latins in the Eaſt was far from recommending their religion. It was with much difficulty that the king of Armenia brought his people to ſubmit to the ſee of Rome after the conqueſt of Conſtantinople, tho' they had not long before been reconciled to the Greek church. They wanted the aſſiſtance of the Latins, and their union continued no longer.

When the king of Hungary wrote in A. D. 1238 to Gregory IX, who had urged him to attack Aſon king of Bulgaria for joining the Greek emperor againſt the Latins, he ſaid he would reduce Bulgaria to depend upon himſelf with reſpect to temporals, and on the pope in ſpirituals, provided he might have the diſpoſal of the church livings; the principal reaſon for which he ſaid was, that if he entered the country accompanied by the pope's legate, all the people would think that he was about to reduce them to ſubjection to the ſee of Rome, of which they had ſo great dread, that they would die rather than ſubmit to it. For, ſays he, they often reproach us, and other Chriſtians, with being ſlaves to the church of Rome.

When

When Gregory IX was endeavouring to bring all the East into subjection to the Roman see, the Greek patriarch of Antioch, supported by the patriarch of Constantinople, excommunicated the pope and all the church of Rome; maintaining that his church was superior to that of Rome in antiquity and dignity. St. Peter, he said, first established his see at Antioch, and there he was received with due respect; but when he went to Rome he suffered every injury, and at length a violent death; that he therefore left the power of binding and loosing to the Greeks, rather than to the see of Rome, which is constantly defiled with simony, and all sorts of crimes.

The temporal power of the pope was always a galling circumstance to the people of Rome, and they made many attempts to emancipate themselves from it. In A. D. 1234 Gregory IX was driven from the city by the people, on the pretence that they had the privilege of not being excommunicated by any pope, or having their city laid under an interdict. To this he answered, that he was superior to all the faithful, even kings and emperors, and much more to those to whom he was the proper pastor. They had also differences with him of a civil nature, and despising his spiritual censures, they came to an open war with him; but a peace was made between them the year following.

Alexander IV was alſo driven out of Rome by the people, who diſregarded his excommunication, denying his right to paſs that ſentence upon them. He retired to Viterbo in May A. D. 1257, and did not return till September the year following. This pope durſt not live in Rome all the laſt four years of his life, and he died at Viterbo in A. D. 1261.

Such, however, was the advantage of which the popes were poſſeſſed, that at length they got the better of this, as well as all their other difficulties. In A. D. 1278 Nicolas III made a conſtitution, in which he claimed the ſole ſovereignty of the city of Rome from the grant of Conſtantine; ordering that for the future, no emperor, king, prince, or other lord, ſhould have the government of Rome under the title of *ſenator*, *captain*, *patrician*, or any other, and that thoſe civil offices ſhould only be held one year. However the ſpirit of the citizens was not ſubdued. For on the acceſſion of Martin IV in A. D. 1281 the people of Rome choſe him for their civil governor, only for his life, and, as they ſaid, not as pope, but on account of his perſonal qualities; and the pope accepted it on thoſe terms.

SECTION

SECTION III.

Of the Tranſactions of the Popes with the Emperors of Germany in this Period.

THE tranſactions of the popes with the emperors of Germany makes no ſmall part of the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of this period, and we clearly perceive in the courſe of them an increaſing contempt of papal cenſures, and that nothing but the ſtate of politics gave the popes any advantage in thoſe conteſts.

After all the oppoſition that the popes had made to the pretenſions of Philip of Suabia, legates being ſent to him, and he writing a ſubmiſſive letter, he was abſolved from the excommunication he had ſo long lain under, and the peace of the empire was on the point of being ſettled, when this prince was murdered in A. D. 1208. On his death Otho was unanimouſly acknowledged emperor, and was crowned at Rome by Innocent III; but on his quarrelling with the people of Rome, and refuſing to ſurrender to the pope the eſtates of the counteſs Matilda, he excommunicated him, and proceeded ſo far as to abſolve his ſubjects from their oath of allegiance to him. Otho, however,

made light of the pope's proceedings againſt him, tho' by his expreſs order the excommunication had been repeated by the patriarch of Aquileia and Grada, the archbiſhops of Ravenna, and Genoa, and the ſuffragans of the church of Milan, that ſee being then vacant. He continued his conqueſts in Apulia and Calabria againſt Frederic, hoping to drive him out of Sicily; and the pope, alarmed at his ſucceſs, ſent ſix ambaſſadors in order to make peace with him, but the negotiation was without effect.

In the mean time the affairs of Frederic aſſumed a better aſpect; and he going into Germany, where he had many partiſans, Otho went thither too in A. D. 1212; but being defeated by the French in the battle of Bouvines, he was deſerted by every body, Frederic was univerſally received as emperor, and the pope confirmed his election at the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, on his promiſing to leave the kingdom of Sicily to his ſon, dependent on the holy ſee. Otho died May 19th, A. D. 1218.

Frederic II, whoſe reign was a long one, was at variance with ſeveral popes in ſucceſſion. With Honorius III he had a difference about the appointment of biſhops in Apulia, and other places, and when the pope gave the ſees to thoſe whom he thought proper, the emperor would not ſuffer them

them to take poſſeſſion. The ſame, at the ſame time, was the conduct of Ferdinand III king of Caſtile.

Gregory IX, having been offended with Frederic on various accounts, proceeded at length ſo far as to excommunicate him in A. D. 1239, and to abſolve his ſubjects from their oath of allegiance to him, for not yielding to him the iſle of Sardinia, which he pretended belonged to the holy ſee. Both the pope and the emperor publiſhed their ſeveral manifeſto's to the princes of Europe, in juſtification of their conduct. That of the emperor was very large, and concludes with his ſaying, that he knew of nothing that he had done to draw on him this perſecution from the pope, but that he declined treating with him about the marriage of his niece to his natural ſon, king of ſome part of Sardinia, and deſiring all the temporal princes to conſider themſelves as attacked thro' him. In anſwer to the particular complaints of the pope, which was a ſeparate writing, he mentioned his having withdrawn from the Templars and Hoſpitallers ſome eſtates that had been given to them in Sicily, on condition of their ſelling them again to other citizens, leſt they ſhould, in proceſs of time, get poſſeſſion of all the lands in the kingdom; which is the firſt act of *Mortmain*, as they were afterwards called, that we read of.

In reply to the emperor, the pope publiſhed another letter, in which he makes him to be *the beaſt* in the Revelation which roſe out of the ſea. He ſaid that the refuſal of the marriage came from himſelf, and not from the emperor; and from his denying the power of a pope to excommunicate him, he ſaid that, being guilty of this capital hereſy, it might be concluded that he had no more belief in other articles of Chriſtian faith. But he farther charged the emperor with having ſaid, that the world had been deceived by three impoſtors, Moſes, Chriſt, and Mahomet, that none but madmen could believe that God, the creator of all things, could be born of a virgin, and that man could only be conceived by the union of the two ſexes. This writing was publiſhed July 1ſt, A. D. 1239.

The emperor, in his reply, ſaid that the pope was the *dragon* which had deceived the world, Antichriſt, Balaam, and the prince of darkneſs. In anſwer to the charge of his calling Chriſt an impoſtor, he gives the articles of his faith with reſpect to the divinity of Chriſt, and the incarnation, and ſpeaks of Moſes and Chriſt as became a Chriſtian. As to the pope's cenſures, he conſidered them as null, and to be revenged by the ſword, if the cardinals did not bring him to reaſon, and put a ſtop to his violence. After this the emperor gave orders to ſend all the mendicant friars out of Sicily,

to

to levy a tax upon all cathedral churches, and to confiſcate the effects of all the foreign clergy. He alſo ordered the puniſhment of death to all perſons who ſhould bring letters from the pope, or pay any regard to them.

Even the German prelates, who were ordered by the pope to publiſh the excommunication of the emperor, and were threatened if they did not do it, paid no regard to the injunction, but intreated the pope to uſe more forbearance, and make peace with the emperor, and ſo put an end to the ſcandal. The patriarch of Aquileia even joined in communion with the emperor, and the Teutonic knights took his part. The pope, however, unmoved by all this, renewed his excommunication of the emperor, and of his ſon, who had taken poſſeſſion of the March of Ancona, which the pope ſaid belonged to him. At this time Elias, who had been general of the Franciſcans (and had been a great advocate for a relaxation of the rules of the order, and after being depoſed had been reſtored to his power and greatly abuſed it) being again depoſed, joined the emperor, and exclaimed with great violence againſt the court of Rome, as full of uſury, ſimony and avarice. The pope, he ſaid, encroached upon the rights of the emperor, and thought of nothing but amaſſing mo-

ney, and by the moſt unjuſt means, and for this he was excommunicated.

The pope met with as little encouragement from France. Having made an offer of the imperial dignity to Robert the king's brother, Lewis, with the advice of his lords, replied, that the pope had no right to depoſe ſo great a prince, not convicted of any crime; that if he was depoſed, it ſhould be by a general council, and that his enemies, among whom the pope was the chief, ought not to be heard againſt him. He is innocent, ſaid the king, with reſpect to me, and has always been a good neighbour. I will not make war upon him, eſpecially as he will be ſupported by ſo many kingdoms, and the juſtice of his cauſe. If, ſaid the king, the pope ſhould by our means ſubdue Frederic, he will be more inſolent, and trample upon all princes. He promiſed, however, to ſend ambaſſadors to the emperor, to make inquiry concerning his faith; ſaying, if that be orthodox, why ſhould I attack him, tho' if he be in an error, I ſhall purſue him to extremity, as I would any other perſon, even the pope himſelf.

The pope alſo without any effect ſolicited the princes of the empire to make another election of an emperor. He ſucceeded, tho' with much difficulty, in obtaining from Henry III of England a fifth of the incomes of the church livings in that king-

kingdom, for the purpoſe of carrying on the war againſt Frederic.

In Italy the cardinal John de Colonna, the pope's legate in the March of Ancona, joined the emperor, who. as well as his ſon, made great progreſs in his war againſt the pope in A. D. 1241. The pope having called a general council to be held at Rome, for the purpoſe of proceeding againſt the emperor. this prince threatened all who ſhould attend it; and many prelates who had embarked at Genoa, being met by the emperor's gallies from Naples, were taken, treated with much indignity, and carried firſt to Naples, and then to Salerno. Among them were the abbots of Clugni, Citeaux, and Clairvaux, and the biſhop of Paleſtrina, who was particularly obnoxious to the emperor. At the interceſſion of the king of France the prelates of that kingdom were ſet at liberty. After this advantage the emperor approached near to Rome, obliging the churches and monaſteries to advance him large ſums of money; and tho' at that time the Tartars having conquered Ruſſia and Hungary, making the moſt dreadful devaſtations, and were threatening Germany, he did not leave the war in Italy, when the pope died the 20th of Auguſt, A. D. 1241.

On the acceſſion of pope Innocent IV, which did not take place till after a long vacancy, ſome

attempts were made to procure a peace, but they did not ſucceed; and from this time the affairs of the emperor went backwards. However, in A. D. 1243, commiſſaries being appointed on both ſides, matters were accommodated between them, the emperor reſtoring all the places he had taken from the pope, and declaring that it was not from contempt that he had not obeyed the ſentence pronounced by pope Gregory, but becauſe it had not been announced to him; and with reſpect to this he ackowledged that he had been blameworthy, and promiſed to expiate his offence by alms, faſting, and other pious works. He engaged alſo to repair all the wrongs that had been done to the prelates who had been his priſoners, and for the future to obey the pope in every thing, without prejudice to the rights of the empire.

It is remarkable that, as with reſpect to the ſimilar caſe of preceding emperors, nothing was ſaid of Frederic being reſtored to the poſſeſſion of the empire, tho' he had been formally depoſed, as well as excommunicated. He had always been conſidered as emperor by all the princes of Europe.

Frederic, however, ſoon repented of his conceſſions, and let the pope know that he would not execute what he had promiſed, till he had received abſolution, which the pope thinking to be unreaſonable, the treaty was broken off, and the emperor's

peror's lieutenant endeavoured to get poſſeſſion of the pope's perſon. He, being aware of the deſign, mounted a ſwift horſe, and from Citta de Caſtella, whither he had gone on his way to meet the emperor, he rode thirty-four miles on his way to Rome, unknown to any but his own ſervants. On the 29th of June he went on board a ſhip at Civita Vecchia, and with ſome difficulty arrived at Genoa the 5th of July. In this new emergency the pope again applied for pecuniary aſſiſtance to the king of England. But the emperor writing to him in his own vindication, ſaid that, if he would be adviſed by him, he would relieve him from the tribute with which Innocent III had loaded the nation, and all the other vexations of the court of Rome; and if he would not, he would take his revenge on all his ſubjects whom he ſhould find in his dominions; and it is probable that the king was influenced by this advice.

The pope dreading the power of the emperor, with whom he was now at open war, ſolicited to be received in France, in Arragon, and in England, but was refuſed in them all. The adviſers of Henry III ſaid on this occaſion, "We have had al-" ready too much of uſury and ſimony from the " Romans, without the pope coming hither him-" ſelf to plunder the goods of the church, and of " the kingdom."

Inno-

Innocent, however, was not discouraged, but renewed his excommunication of the emperor, and required all other ecclesiastics to do the same. On this occasion a curé in Paris distinguished himself by saying before the ceremony, "I am ordered to "excommunicate the emperor Frederic, but I "know not the reason of it, only that he and the "pope are at variance. I do not know which of "them is in the right; but, as far as I have power, "I excommunicate him of the two who has done "the wrong, and absolve him who suffers it." The emperor, hearing of this, sent the curé a present; but the pope, whose conduct was evidently reflected upon, punished him for the liberty he had taken.

A general council being held at Lyons, Thaddée de Suisse, a knight and doctor of laws, the emperor's ambassador, boldly defended his conduct; but perceiving the disposition of that assembly, the emperor did not chuse to attend himself. Here a sentence of deposition was pronounced against him, but it was observed that the pope made this his own act, pronouncing it as in the presence of the council, and not as with its concurrence, as in all the other decrees of the same council.

The emperor was much disturbed when he heard this sentence, but placing the crown on his head,

head, he ſaid, "I have not loſt it yet, and will "not part with it without bloodſhed." In his letter to the princes on this occaſion, he told them as before, that his cauſe was the ſame with their own, he complained of the ambition of the court of Rome, and the vices which prevailed in it, ſome of which he ſaid it was not decent to mention; that it was the immenſe wealth of that court which was the cauſe of all the miſchief, and therefore he was determined to reduce it, and bring the popes to the condition of the primitive biſhops, who imitated the humility of our Saviour; whereas theſe, immerſed in the affairs of the world, and ſwimming in pleaſure, deſpiſed God; that the exceſs of their riches ſtifled in them all ſenſe of religion, and that it would be meritorious to deprive them of their pernicious wealth; and he exhorted them to join him in doing it.

To this bold propoſal the princes of that age were not prepared to accede, and the letter gave offence; a great degree of wealth being then generally thought neceſſary to ſupport the character of the clergy. But another letter, which the emperor wrote to the king of France, to ſhew the violation of all the forms of regular judicature in his condemnation, and the danger that would ariſe to other princes from the power which the popes aſſumed to depoſe them, gained him many friends.

The

The pope, however, did every thing in his power to raiſe up enemies to the emperor. At his perſuaſion ſome of the electors made Henry landgrave of Thuringia king of the Romans, on the 17th of May A. D. 1246. He even wrote to the ſultan of Egypt, to perſuade him to break the treaty which his father had made with the emperor. But the Mahometan prince with great indignation replied, "Your envoy ſpeaks to us of Jeſus Chriſt, "whom we know better, and honour more than "you do; and my father, having made a treaty "with the emperor, I think myſelf bound by it."

Henry being defeated by Conrad the ſon of Frederick, and dying of vexation in lent A. D. 1247, William brother of the count of Holland was choſen king of the Romans in his place. But Frederick, not diſmayed by theſe meaſures, publiſhed an ordonance in A. D. 1248, by which all prieſts refuſing to perform divine ſervice, or adminiſter the ſacraments, were baniſhed from their place of abode, and deprived of all their goods. On the other hand the pope publiſhed freſh bulls of excommunication, and ordered a cruſade to be preached againſt the emperor and his ſon, with the ſame indulgences as to thoſe who went to the holy land.

In this ſtate of things the people were much divided, ſome taking part with the pope, and ſome with the emperor. At Ratiſbon the people roſe againſt

againſt the biſhop who obeyed the pope, and who had excommunicated them, and laid the city under an interdict, and they continued to bury in the church-yard as before. They even took out of the grave the body of a counteſs who had ſubmitted to the pope, and, after dragging it about the ſtreets, threw it to the dogs. They alſo made it death to any perſon to take the croſs againſt the emperor.

On the other hand, the pope ordered the biſhops to add to the ſentence of excommunication of the partiſans of the emperor, the deprivation of all fiefs held of the church, and all church benefices to the fourth generation, with other puniſhments, which the hiſtorian ſays he had no power to execute. In Suabia ſome perſons preached openly againſt the pope, the clergy, and the monks; ſaying that the pope was a heretic, and the biſhops ſimoniacs, without the power of binding and looſing; that they had deceived the world too long, that no biſhop had power to forbid the celebration of divine ſervice, that the Dominicans and Franciſcans perverted the church by their preaching, and lived bad lives, as well as the Ciſtercians, and other monks.

Had the emperor continued ſucceſsful in the field, he might have humbled the pope; but being defeated before Parma, which he had beſieged, his authority was much diminiſhed. He alſo ſuffered

fered in the opinion of many by his harſh treatment of the biſhop of Arezzo, who was taken in arms againſt him. But the clergy who took part with the pope, alſo hurt his cauſe, ſays Mathew Paris, by their avarice, their ſimony, uſury, and other vices.

In the mean time William, being aſſiſted with money from the pope, and his cauſe being zealouſly eſpouſed by the preaching friars, beſieged and took Aix la Chapelle, and was there crowned in A. D. 1248. Frederick being ſeized with ſickneſs, offered honorable terms of peace to the pope; but the haughty prelate would not liſten to them, which offended many, and diſpoſed them to favour Frederick. At length the death of this emperor in A. D. 1250 put an end to this long conteſt.

On this event his ſon Conrad, tho' oppoſed by the pope, gained ſtrength, while William was obliged to retire into Holland, and live at the expence of his brother, whom he had made count of it. In this ſtate of things the title of *king of the Romans* was offered to ſeveral perſons, all of whom refuſed to accept of it. Among them was Haquin king of Norway, who, in anſwer, ſaid publickly, that he was ready to fight the enemies of the church, but not thoſe of the pope. This, ſays Matthew Paris, I myſelf heard him declare, with a great oath.

In

In conſequence of the advantages which Conrad gained over the pope and his partiſans in Italy, the pope publiſhed a cruſade againſt him, with greater indulgences than to thoſe who went to Paleſtine; for they extended to the fathers and mothers of the cruſaders. This gave great offence, eſpecially as at this time the king of France was in Paleſtine, demanding ſuccours. The queen reſented it ſo much, that ſhe ordered the lands of all theſe new cruſaders to be ſeized, ſo that the expedition came to nothing.

But the cauſe of the pope was now, as on many other occaſions, wonderfully favoured by events. Conrad dying in A. D. 1254, and leaving a ſon, generally called Conradin, only two years old, under the care of Mainfroi, regent of the kingdom, who ſubmitted to the pope, and was received into favour. But the legate, whom on this occaſion the pope ſent into Sicily, behaved in ſuch a manner, as loſt him many friends, and Mainfroi taking advantage of it, left the pope, and gained a victory over his troops; and in this ſituation of things Innocent IV died December 4th, A. D. 1254.

The firſt care of his ſucceſſor, Alexander IV, was to ſtop the progreſs of Mainfroi; and with a view to this, he gave the kingdom of Sicily to Edmund, the ſecond ſon of the king of England, and releaſed him from his vow to go to the holy land,

on condition of his marching againſt Mainfroi in Apulia; and a cruſade was preached againſt him in England, with the ſame indulgence as for Paleſtine, which ſhocked the people very much; the ſame pardon being given for ſhedding the blood of Chriſtians as for that of infidels. And Mainfroi in A. D. 1206 having made himſelf maſter of almoſt the whole of Apulia and Sicily, was crowned king at Palermo the 11th of Auguſt A. D. 1258; and tho' the pope excommunicated him in A. D. 1259, he was joined by the people of Lombardy. Continuing to make great progreſs in Italy in A. D. 1263, the pope not only repeated his excommunication, but laid the kingdom of Sicily under an interdict. No regard, however, being paid to it, he thought proper to moderate his cenſures.

Events, however, as before, wonderfully favoured the popes. Clement IV having given the kingdom of Sicily to Charles count of Anjou and Provence, Mainfroi was killed in a battle he fought with him the 26th of February A. D. 1266, and in conſequence of this victory the greateſt part of Italy reverted to the obedience of the pope. Alſo Conradin, the grandſon of Frederic, who had been received as emperor in Italy, and even at Rome, tho' in a ſtate of excommunication by the pope, coming to a battle with Charles, was defeated Auguſt 23d, A. D. 1268, and, being afterwards taken priſoner, was beheaded.

It

It was in this period that the two parties diſtinguiſhed by the names of *Guelphs* and *Gibellines* became famous in Italy, the former taking the part of the popes, and the latter that of the emperors. The diſtinction began in Germany in A. D. 1139, the Gibellines being ſo called from Gibel, a city in which Henry the ſon of Conrad III was born, and the Guelphs from Guelf duke of Bavaria. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 669.

SECTION IV.

Tranſactions of the Popes with Peter King of Arragon, and John King of England.

THE tranſactions of the popes with Peter of Arragon were the ſequel of thoſe with the emperor and Mainfroi; Peter having in right of his wife the daughter of Mainfroi invaded Sicily when in poſſeſſion of Charles of Anjou, whom the popes favoured. Martin IV in A. D. 1283 publiſhed a cruſade againſt him, on pretence that the war with Charles hindered the relief of the holy land, and alſo that his attacking Sicily was an invaſion of the property of the church, ſince Sicily belonged to the holy ſee. However, theſe cen-

ſures againſt the king of Arragon, and the countries ſubject to him, which were laid under an interdict, produced no effect. They were deſpiſed not only by the king himſelf, his lords, and other laymen, but even by the biſhops, and the monks of all orders. His partiſans did not conſider themſelves as really excommunicated, and paid no regard to the interdict; appealing from the ſentence of Martin to that of a future pope. In contempt of the king not being allowed the title of king of Arragon, he called himſelf "knight of Arragon, "father of two kings, and maſter of the ſea."

Philip the Hardy, king of France, having received from the pope the title of *king of Arragon*, took the croſs againſt him. For the pope, not content with his cenſures, had publiſhed a cruſade againſt Peter; and he ſet out on the expedition the 25th of June A. D. 1285. But the cruſaders of whom his army was chiefly compoſed committed as much diſorder as the other troops: They profaned churches by the effuſion of blood, and committed other impurities in them. They even violated nuns, and carried away ſacred veſſels, croſſes, images, books, and ornaments, and ſold them. They took down the bells, and either broke them, or carried them away. Thus they conducted themſelves during the whole campaign, pretending to gain the promiſed indulgence. Some, who had

not

not even an arrow, took up ſtones, and throwing them ſaid, either in jeſt or earneſt, "I throw this "ſtone againſt Peter of Arragon, in order to gain "the indulgence." At length his army was ſeized with a diſorder which obliged them to retreat, and the king himſelf died of it.

Peter of Arragon died the year following, and in the article of death was reconciled to the church. But he left the kingdom of Sicily to his ſon James, who treading in his father's ſteps, was excommunicated, and an interdict was laid on every place where he ſhould come. Two biſhops, who had crowned him, were ordered by the pope to appear before him, but neither the king nor the biſhops paid any regard to the excommunication, tho' it was repeated preſently after.

On the death of Alfonſo king of Arragon in A. D. 1291, pope Nicolas IV forbad his brother James meddling with the government of Arragon, or any of its dependencies, and ordered him to reſign Sicily to king Charles, or he would proceed againſt him both temporally and ſpiritually. He alſo wrote to the biſhops, abbots, and all the clergy of Arragon, forbidding them, under ſevere penalties, to acknowledge James as king. But theſe prohibitions and menaces had no effect. For as ſoon as James heard of the death of his brother, he left Sicily under the government of another brother,

and landing at Barcelona, went to Saragoſſa, where he was ſolemnly crowned king of Arragon the 24th of September A. D. 1291.

The orders of the pope were as little regarded in Caſtile as in Arragon, when they were thought to be unreaſonable. Pope Martin ordered Sanches king of Caſtile to quit his wife, as being in the third degree of relationſhip to him, threatening him with excommunication, and other puniſhments, temporal and ſpiritual in A. D. 1263; but no regard was paid to them. The king kept his wife, and had many children by her, and among them Ferdinand, who ſucceeded him.

In order to give an account of the tranſactions of the court of Rome with king John of England, I muſt go back to the time of Innocent III, who had an advantage in the greater ignorance and ſuperſtition of the Engliſh nation, which he had not in the more ſouthern parts of Europe; but notwithſtanding this, ſuch was the ſpirit and obſtinacy of this prince, that nothing but the dread of an invaſion of his kingdom brought him to ſubmit.

The pope having in A. D. 1207 nominated Stephen Langton to the archbiſhoprick of Canterbury, againſt the will of the king, who propoſed the biſhop of Norwich, the pope threatened him with excommunication, and an interdict on his kingdom,

dom, if he did not consent to it. But the king, being in a great rage swore, as his custom was, by the teeth of God, that if the pope should lay an interdict on his lands, he would send him all the prelates in England, confiscate their effects, and put out the eyes of all the Romans among them, that they might be distinguished from all other men; and he ordered three bishops, viz. of London, Eli, and Worcester, who brought him the pope's orders, to be gone from his presence, if they would retire with safety. They accordingly withdrew; and presently after, in obedience to the orders they had received from the pope, actually laid an interdict on the whole kingdom; and notwithstanding the kings orders to the contrary, it was so strictly observed, that no religious service was performed, besides confession, the viaticum, and the baptism of infants. As to the dead, the historians say they were buried like dogs, in the high ways. The three bishops having done this, privately left the kingdom.

In these circumstances, there being no fresh consecration of oil on the next holy thursday, so that there was none for the baptism of infants, the pope gave orders that the old might be used, or that fresh oil might be consecrated for the purpose; and as there were no consecrated waters with which to give the viaticum to the dying, he said their faith

must supply that deficiency, since Austin had said, that if they believed that they partook of it, they virtually did so.

Tho' this interdict had continued two years, the king was so far from making any concessions, that he violently persecuted the clergy; and this fresh provocation led the pope, on the 12th of January A. D. 1209. to give the three bishops a commission to excommunicate him, which accordingly they did. A theologian of the name of Masson encouraged the king in his resistance, teaching that the pope had not received from St. Peter any authority in things of a temporal nature, and in consequence of this obtained several church livings. But the pope being informed of the maxims that he taught, deprived him of them; so that, as the historian says, he begged his bread from door to door.

In A. D. 1211 the pope sent his legate Pandolf, and others, to persuade the king to give satisfaction to the church; but he not agreeing to the pope's terms, his subjects and vassals were declared to be absolved from their oath of allegiance to him; all persons were forbidden under pain of excommunication to have any intercourse with him, even at table, or so much as speak to him. But some of the bishops encouraging the king, he persevered in his obstinacy.

On

On this the pope wrote to the king of France, exhorting him, for the remiſſion of his ſins, to undertake the dethroning of John, and ſeizing his kingdom. He alſo addreſſed a letter to the lords and knights of other nations, urging them to take the croſs for the invaſion of England; promiſing that they who engaged in this expedition ſhould receive the ſame protection from the holy ſee as if they had gone to the holy land. In conſequence of this, the king of France, having long wiſhed for ſuch an excuſe, actually declared war againſt John; and at this time it was that, to recommend himſelf ſtill more to the pope, he took back his wife Ingelburga, from whom, notwithſtanding the repeated orders of the pope to the contrary, he had been ſeparated ſixteen years.

This conduct of the king of France gave John ſo much alarm, that he was perſuaded at length to ſubmit to the pope, as the only way to preſerve his kingdom. Accordingly he ſignified his intention to do ſo on the 13th of May A. D. 1203, and on the 15th of the ſame month he even made a formal ſurrender of the kingdoms of England and Ireland, holding them from that time as a vaſſal of the pope; and beſides Peter's pence, he promiſed to pay to the pope every year a thouſand marks of ſilver, and to oblige all his ſucceſſors to do the ſame, on pain of forfeiting his crown. In

the preſence of the legate Pandolf, he laid aſide his crown, and took the oath of fealty, receiving it again from his hands. A piece of money being delivered as a pledge of the fealty, the haughty prelate trampled upon it.

From England the legate went to France, and ordered the king to deſiſt from his invaſion of the dominions of king John, now a vaſſal of the pope; at which, having been at a great expence in his preparations, he was much enraged; and ſo far was he from rejoicing at the converſion of his brother, as a Chriſtian king ought to have done, that he would have proceeded, but that his vaſſal the count of Flanders abandoned him. The exiled biſhops then returned, and having all their property reſtored to them, they took off the king's excommunication; and the interdict on the kingdom was taken off the 25th of June A. D. 1214, after it had continued ſix years and three months.

So far was it from being thought that the king acted from a principle of conſcience in this buſineſs, that, according to Matthew Paris, he made an offer of the ſubjection of his kingdom to the Mahometan king of Morocco, promiſing to renounce Chriſtianity, in order to obtain his aſſiſtance, but that the muſſelman treated the offer with contempt. As a farther evidence that he was no believer in Chriſtianity, it is ſaid that, ſeeing a flag which

which he had taken in hunting to be very fat, he obſerved, that he had thriven very well, tho' he had never gone to maſs. The pope, however, on the idea of his being a true penitent, and faithful ſon of the church, wrote to him; ſaying that what he had done was without doubt from the ſpirit of God, and that he now poſſeſſed his kingdom in a more ſublime and ſolid manner than ever; ſince it was become, in the language of ſcripture, a ſacerdotal kingdom.

After this the king having been compelled to grant his lay barons a charter of liberties, and repenting of what he had done, the pope not only abſolved him from his oath, but forbad his obſervance of it on pain of excommunication. He alſo ordered the barons to renounce their claims; and as they paid no regard to this, he excommunicated them. But as this excommunication was only general, they made no account of it. At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, this excommunication of the refractory Engliſh barons was repeated, and now ſome of them were mentioned by name. An interdict was, moreover laid on their lands, and alſo on the city of London; but the citizens deſpiſed it, and maintained that the barons ought not to regard it, nor the clergy to publiſh it, ſince the pope has nothing to do with temporal affairs, but that the cowardly Romans wiſhed

wiſhed to rule the world by their excommunications.

The barons continuing their oppoſition made an offer of the kingdom to Lewis the ſon of the king of France, but the pope forbad him to accept of it, as it belonged to the holy ſee. In anſwer to this, the king of France and his lords ſaid that no king had a right to diſpoſe of his kingdom without the conſent of his lords; and Lewis notwithſtanding the remonſtrance of the pope's legate, who excommunicated him and all his adherents, and eſpecially Simon de Langton, brother of the archbiſhop of Canterbury, went to England; and the war was carried on with various ſucceſs. After the death of John in A. D. 1216, and the acceſſion of Henry III, the affairs of Lewis declined, and the legate joining the army of the young king, excommunicated Lewis, and publiſhed a plenary indulgence to thoſe who fought againſt him. Being, after this, defeated by the army of Henry, he left the kingdom in May A. D. 1217.

SECTION

SECTION V.

Of the State of the Clergy in this Period.

THE ſpirit of the clergy continued as high in this period as in the preceding, tho' the ſpirit of the laity roſe in oppoſition to them, and tho' many of their uſurpations had been of ſo long continuance, that they were not diſputed.

It appears from what paſſed at the council of Milan, in A. D. 1225, that the king of France allowed the juriſdiction of the clergy to extend to all caſes reſpecting oaths, fealty, and homage, wills, and marriages. The biſhops had alſo claimed the cogniſance of all cauſes in which the vaſſals of the church were concerned againſt any perſon whatever.

In A. D. 1232 Maurice archbiſhop of Rouen being cited to appear before the king, refuſed, ſaying, that after God he had no other judge than the pope, both in things temporal and things ſpiritual. On this the king ordered all the domains of the church to be ſeized; but the archbiſhop laid all the eſtates of the king in his dioceſe under an interdict; and on his complaining to the pope, the king was obliged to reſtore what he had taken, after the interdict had continued thirteen months.

In

In the ſame year the king going with an armed force, in order to put a ſtop to a ſedition in the city of Beauvais, which had ariſen from a quarrel between the mayor and the common people, and in which many lives had been loſt, the biſhop oppoſed him, ſaying, that himſelf was the only perſon who had any juriſdiction in that place. The king taking poſſeſſion of the city, and putting a garriſon into it, the biſhop appealed to a council held at Noyon, and on inquiry being made into the ſtate of the facts, the king was ſummoned to make reſtitution; and not complying, the archbiſhop laid all his dioceſe under an interdict, and the other biſhops extended it to the whole province. An appeal was then made to Rome, but the archbiſhop dying ſoon after peace was made with his ſucceſſor.

In A. D. 1237 many of the lords of France wrote to the pope, to complain of the clergy refuſing to obey any ſummons to the king's courts in things of a temporal nature, tho' they held their baronies of him, and in time paſt had always been accuſtomed to do it. King Lewis interpoſed his authority in favour of the laity, making an ordonance to authorize his vaſſals and lords not to appear in the eccleſiaſtical courts, for matters of a temporal nature; and if they were to be excommunicated for their contumacy, the eccleſiaſtical judge

judge ſhould be obliged to take off the excommunication, by ſeizing his temporalities, and that the clergy and their vaſſals ſhould ſubmit to the judgment of the king's courts in all civil cauſes. Gregory IX remonſtrated againſt this ordonance of the king; ſaying, that God had given the pope the rights of both eccleſiaſtical and terreſtrial empire, that the king and the lords would reduce the church to a ſtate of ſervitude, but that they ought to fear the excommunication of pope Honorius, againſt all thoſe who ſhould make ordonances againſt the liberties of the church. However, the king would not revoke his ordonance, and continued to be attentive to repreſs the incroachments of the clergy.

Nothing perhaps exceeded the high tone in which pope Honorius reſented ſome inſults offered to his legate by the ſcholars of the univerſity of Paris in A. D. 1225. He publiſhed a conſtitution inflicting the heavieſt penalties on any perſon who ſhould offer his legates any kind of violence. He ſhould, he ſaid, be conſidered as infamous, as if guilty of high treaſon, be treated as a public enemy, be incapable of making a will, or receiving any inheritance, his houſe ſhould be pulled down, and his eſtates confiſcated, with many other penalties. If the prince or magiſtrate did not execute this order, he was to be excommunicated, and if the

the people did not oppoſe him, the country was to be laid under an interdict.

There appeared in this period to be little wiſdom in theſe violent church cenſures, the laity in general having, in many places at leaſt, begun to conſider the natural equity of them, and if they thought them unjuſt, to pay no regard to them; ſo that it was thought neceſſary to add civil to eccleſiaſtical puniſhments. It appeared particularly at the council of Narbonne in A. D. 1227, when it was ordered that as the laity of that province deſpiſed excommunication, every excommunicated perſon ſhould be fined nine livres and one denier, and that if he remained in a ſtate of excommunication a whole year, his goods ſhould be confiſcated.

In A. D. 1253 clergy of France applied to Lewis IX for his order to confiſcate the effects of thoſe who refuſed to be abſolved after being excommunicated a year and a day; ſince, as they ſaid, no regard was paid to their excommunications, and perſons even choſe to die in that ſtate. The king replied, that he would willingly grant it with reſpect to thoſe who were juſtly excommunicated; but the biſhops replying that they were the only judges of that, he refuſed, mentioning the caſe of the count of Britany; who after having been ſeven years excommunicated by the biſhop of his province, was judged by the pope himſelf to have been treated

treated unjuſtly, and abſolved. About the ſame time it was agreed at the council of Bourdeaux, that if any perſon in a ſtate of excommunication did not get abſolved within a year and a day, he ſhould be conſidered as a heretic, and ſubjected to temporal puniſhment as ſuch.

In A. D. 1247 there had been a more ſerious alarm given to the clergy of France, by a general conſpiracy of the barons of that kingdom againſt them, expreſſing their determination not to ſubmit to their juriſdiction, except in caſes of hereſy, marriage, and uſury. They took an oath to ſtand by one another, appointed the duke of Burgundy, and three others, to act for them, and taxed themſelves for the ſupport of the common cauſe. Pope Innocent IV was much diſturbed when he heard of this; but adviſed the clergy to oppoſe the meaſures of the barons with all their power. Perceiving, however, that church cenſures had no effect, he gained many of the principal of the barons by giving church livings to their relations, and granting them other favours, and by this means warded off the blow for that time.

If it had not been for the ſpirit that now began to be roufed by the incroachments and exactions of the clergy, it is not to ſay where they would have ended. At the council of Lyons in A. D. 1245, the Engliſh ambaſſador complained that the

Italian clergy, who were non reſident, drew from the kingdom more than ſixty thouſand marks of ſilver annually, which was more than the king's revenue.

In the Eaſt the clergy never had the power, or the immenſe revenues, of thoſe in the Weſt; but while Conſtantinople was poſſeſſed by the Latins, ſome ſteps were taken towards bringing them into the ſame ſituation. It had not been the cuſtom in the Eaſt to pay tythes; but it was decreed at the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, that they ſhould be levied in all parts of the Chriſtian world before any other tax, as a mark of the univerſal dominion of God. The proviſion for the biſhops in that part of the world not being thought to be ſufficient, the pope was requeſted to reduce their number; but he choſe rather to give two o them to one perſon, that in future time it might be more eaſy, if it ſhould be convenient, to ſeparate them again. This, ſays Fleury, was the origin of the perſonal union of church livings during the life of the incumbent, which was much abuſed afterwards.

The diſorderly lives of many of the clergy, the natural conſequence of their wealth and power, no leſs than their exactions and uſurpations, contributed to make them odious, and make their cenſures little regarded. It appears from the council

of

of Virſburg in A. D. 1286, that the clergy of Germany were in general very diſorderly. Some of them were not ſufficiently modeſt in their dreſs, they frequented tavers, played at dice, viſited the nuns, chatted and played with them in their own rooms, exerciſed themſelves at tournaments, kept concubines, got poſſeſſion of livings by fraudulent entry, or violence, and ſome ſaid maſs every day merely for hire. Some of the prelates alienated the goods of the church on the pretence of debts. In the wars, which were then frequent in that country, they who took poſſeſſion of the churches made fortreſſes of them, which gave occaſion to the enemy who took them to deſtroy or burn them. Biſhops ſo neglected viſitations, that ſome perſons were not confirmed at the age of ſixty.

But the moſt extraordinary character of a clergyman that occurs in the courſe of this period, is that of Henry biſhop of Liege, brother of Otho count of Guelderland, and couſin of William count of Holland. He had been promoted to that biſhoprick by Innocent IV, who wiſhed to ſupport that count in his pretenſions to the empire. Gregory X, who had been archdeacon of Liege in the time of this Henry, on being made pope, wrote him a letter of expoſtulation, from which we have the following particulars. "We learn," he ſays, "with grief, that you are addicted to ſimony and

" incontinence, ſo that you have had many child-
" ren both before and after your promotion to the
" biſhoprick. You have taken an abbeſs of the
" order of St. Benedict for your public concubine,
" and at a public entertainment boaſted before the
" company that in twenty-two months you had
" fourteen children, to ſome of whom you have
" given or procured benefices with care of ſouls
" before they were of age, and you have given to
" others of your children the goods of your biſhop-
" rick, and thus married them advantageouſly. In
" one of your houſes called the Park, you have
" long kept a nun, together with other women.
" A nunnery in your dioceſe having loſt their ab-
" beſs, you have annulled a canonical election,
" and put in a daughter of a count, to whoſe ſon
" you had married one of your daughters; and
" they ſay that this abbeſs is delivered of a child
" which ſhe had by you. You are ſo negligent in
" the exerciſe of your temporal power, that you
" exempt from puniſhment thieves, murderers,
" and other malefactors, provided they give you
" money. You never recite the liturgy, or even
" hear it, being wholly illiterate; and you often
" appear in a ſecular habit, with ſcarlet, ſo that
" you are more like a knight than a prelate." After this remonſtrance the pope exhorted him to repent, and not to truſt to his youth, which promiſed

him

him a long life. This friendly letter, however, produced no effect, and at the council of Lyons in A. D. 1274 he was depoſed, and lived twelve years after it.

So many of the clergy in this period rendering themſelves odious by their profligacy and rapacity, we cannot wonder that in ſome of the leſs civilized parts of Europe, they were expoſed to great violence. They ſuffered much in Denmark, as appears from the acts of a council confirmed by Alexander IV in A. D. 1257, where it was ordered that, if any biſhop ſhould be ſeized, deprived of any limb, or any other injury be done to him in the kingdom of Denmark, by the order or with the conſent of the king, the country ſhould be laid under an interdict. In the remote parts of Germany the perſons of the clergy were no more ſpared than their goods; no reſpect was paid to the envoys of the biſhops, or the legates of the church of Rome. They were often arreſted, beaten, and ſtripped, and the letters they carried torn.

In this, as alſo in a former period, the clergy were ſometimes guilty of great violence to one another. In A. D. 1222 the biſhop of Caithneſs in Scotland having a difference with his clergy about tythes, and other rights of his church, they murdered him, and burned him in his own kitchen.

SECTION VI.

Of the Monks in this Period, and the Riſe of the Franciſcans, and Dominicans.

IN this period of our hiſtory we find a new and moſt important æra in the affairs of the church, viz. the riſe of the *mendicant orders*, who, when the preceding orders of monks were in general fallen into diſrepute, on account of the relaxation of their diſcipline, acquired the greateſt reputation, not only for their auſterity and abſtractedneſs from the world, but for their activity, and real ſervices to what was then called *the church*, and eſpecially the church of Rome, to which they were particularly devoted.

The diſorders into which the monks in general, not even excepting thoſe of Clugni, or mount Caſſin, formerly ſo famous, had fallen, appeared from the proceedings of the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215. In the former the prior of la Charité revolted from the abbot, and an open war was carried on between them. At this council orders were given for the reformation of the monks in general, but more eſpecially thoſe who had no *general chapters*, as they appeared to be more diſſolute than

than the reſt. All the orders of monks were, therefore, now required to have general chapters, for the expreſs purpoſe of the reformation of abuſes; and as the multiplicity of the orders was found to be a great ſource of abuſe, it was decreed that there ſhould be no new ones formed. So little effect, however, had this regulation, that more new orders were founded after this council than had exiſted before it.

The monaſteries in England being in a ſtate of great diſorder, the pope in A. D. 1234 ſent viſitors to all of them that depended upon him. They were chiefly abbots of the Ciſtercian order, and that of Premontré, but they acted with ſo much harſhneſs and indiſcretion, that there were many appeals from them to the pope, and other viſitors were appointed. On the whole, however, according to Matthew Paris, more harm than good reſulted from the viſitation, which extended to all the kingdom.

Sunk, however, as the monks were in the general eſteem, there were ſome inſtances in this period, as well as the preceding, of perſons of diſtinction thinking there was ſome advantage in dying in that character. James I king of Arragon, ſurnamed *the Conqueror*, on account of his many victories over the Moors, but remarkably addicted to women, finding himſelf dangerouſly ill, put on the

habit of a Ciſtercian monk, and made a vow that if he recovered he would ſpend the remainder of his life in a monaſtery. He died A. D. 1276.

We find, however, much of real religion, tho' mixed with ſuperſtitious rigour, in the ſociety of the *Beghards*, who were men, and of the *Begutes*, who were women, who appeared about this time. The terms ſignify *beggars* in the German language: They diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the meanneſs of their appearance, as well as their earneſtneſs in prayer; and for this reaſon the appellation was often given, without proper diſcrimination, to very different kinds of religioniſts. The ſame perſons were ſometimes called *Lollards*, and in France *Beghines*. In Flanders they were ſometimes called *the fraternity of weavers*, as they were chiefly of that occupation. The firſt regular ſociety of theſe perſons was formed at Antwerp in A. D. 1228. They agreed to live according to a certain rule, and in ſubjection to a chief, but with liberty to return to their former mode of life. Theſe ſocieties never obtained the ſanction of the popes, tho' they were often protected by them from the violence of their enemies. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 82. 87.

After giving this unfavourable account of the monks in general within this period, I proceed to relate the extraordinary hiſtories of St. Francis and Dominic, each the founder of a diſtinct order, tho'

tho' much reſembling one another, both profeſſedly mendicants, and both preachers, in which reſpects they were exceedingly different from the preceding order of monks, who were confined to one place, and with whom begging was diſreputable; and who, far from preaching, devoted themſelves to ſolitary meditation, or joint prayer. Francis appearing a ſhort time before Dominic, I ſhall give his hiſtory, and that of his order, in the firſt place.

St. Francis, as he was afterwards denominated, was born at Aſſiſi in Umbria in A. D. 1182, his father being a merchant. At the age of twenty-five he diſcovered a turn of mind ſo wholly religious, and ſo unfit for buſineſs, that his father was much diſpleaſed, and threatened to diſinherit him. To this the young man was ſo far from having any objection, that, in the preſence of the biſhop of Aſſiſi, he ſolemnly diſclaimed all expectations from him, and declared that from that time he would acknowledge only his father in heaven.

From this time he devoted himſelf to works of charity, and thoſe of the moſt humiliating kind, ſuch as attending upon lepers. He repaired, and chiefly with the labour of his own hands, two churches, which were in a ruinous condition, the latter about a mile from Aſſiſi, and in this he lodged, and paſſed

two years. One day, as he was hearing mass in this place, he was so forcibly struck with the following expressions in the charge that our Saviour gave to the twelve apostles previous to their mission, Mat. 10, 9. *Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves, &c.* that he cried out, "This is what I seek;" and immediately he threw away his shoes, his staff, his wallet, and all his money, and kept only one coat. He also laid aside his girdle which was of leather, and made use of a piece of rope in its place.

From this time, in imitation of the apostles, he began to exhort other persons to repent, and he did it in a very forcible manner, and with wonderful success, always beginning his discourses with saying, "God give you peace." When he had got three disciples, they dispersed themselves to preach in different places; when some persons received them with great humanity, looking with astonishment on their extraordinary dress and austerities, but in other places people made a mock of them, and abused them. This, however, they bore with the greatest patience. When he had seven disciples, he exhorted them to go to different countries, preaching repentance, without regarding any treatment they might meet with; assuring them that, in a short time many of the learned and the noble

noble would join them, and that they would preach to kings and princes, as well as to the common people. When he had eleven disciples, one of whom was as priest, he wrote out a rule for them, taken wholly out of the gospels, and presented it to pope Innocent III, who, after making some objections, approved of it in A. D. 1210.

Francis having obtained this confirmation of his institute, went with twelve disciples, and established himself in a church which he had repaired at Pontremoli, and this was the first house of his order, which by way of humility he called that of the *minor brethren*, *fratres minores*, in French *freres*, and in English by corruption *friars*, as the Dominicans had at the same assumed the appellation of *preaching brothers*, or *friars*; and this term it will be convenient to use to distinguish these two orders from the *monks*.

From this place they went forth preaching in the neighbouring towns and villages, not with studied harangues, but in a manner that impressed their hearers in an extraordinary manner, as they had the appearance of men of another world, having their faces always turned towards heaven, whither they were continually directing their audience. Proceeding in this manner, they soon had more followers, and in A. D. 1211 they founded several convents, the most considerable of which were

were thoſe of Cortona, Piſa, and Bologna; and Francis himſelf, having preached thro' all Tuſcany, returned to Aſſiſi in lent in A. D. 1212.

In ſuch veneration was he at this time held, that when he went into any city they rung the bells, and the clergy and people went to meet him, bearing branches of trees, and ſinging, thinking themſelves happy who could kiſs his hands or feet. That lent he preached at his native place, where he had many converts, and among them St. Claire, a young woman of a noble family, who by his direction, tho' only at the age of eighteen, abandoned the world, and notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of her relations, fixed herſelf in a monaſtery firſt at St. Ange de Panſa, where ſhe was joined by her ſiſter Agnes, and then at St. Damien of the order of the Benedictines, which was the firſt church that St. Francis had repaired. Here ſhe continued forty two years, many diſciples joining her; and thus was formed the order of *poor women*, or that of *St. Claire*, being the ſecond order of Franciſcans.

At this time Francis was in doubt whether he ſhould continue to preach, or apply to prayer, and he conſulted one Silveſter, who lived wholly occupied in prayer on a mountain near Aſſiſi, and alſo St. Claire, that they might inform him what was revealed to them on the ſubject; and both their

their anſwers agreeing that he ſhould apply to preaching, he did ſo. Thus determined, which was about A. D. 1216, he gave inſtructions to his diſciples to go in pairs, as the apoſtles had done in their miſſion, behaving with all humility and good order, and preaching peace wherever they came. He ſent them thus inſtructed into Spain, Provence, and Germany, into which country he ſent no leſs than ſixty brothers. He himſelf intended to go to France, but by the advice of his friend cardinal Hugolin biſhop of Oſtia, he ſent another perſon, and continued himſelf in Italy. But his preachers being often inſulted, and the whole order expoſed to violence, he got a *protector* of his order fixed at the court of Rome, and the firſt of them was cardinal Hugolin.

So rapidly did this order of Franciſcans increaſe, that at a chapter general held near Aſſiſi the 26th of May A. D. 1219, when Dominic was preſent, there appeared to be not leſs than five thouſand in it, tho' they had not been eſtabliſhed more than nine or ten years. At this time ſome of the order wiſhed to have a power of preaching independently of the parochial clergy, but Franciſ oppoſed it; ſaying that by their humility, and uſeful ſervices, they ſhould gain the good will of the clergy, that they ſhould cover their faults, and ſupply their defects. And June 11th, of that year

year pope Honorius III iſſued a bull, addreſſed to all biſhops and the higher orders of eccleſiaſtics, recommending the Franciſcans as apoſtolical men, but not giving them any independent powers.

About this time many women were converted by his preachers, and formed themſelves into monaſteries; but he refuſed to take the charge of any of them, except that of St. Claire, and expreſſed his wiſhes that his brethren might have no connection with them. He uſed to ſay, "I fear that "while God takes women from us." (for the Franciſcans took the vow of continence) "the devil "ſhould ſend us his ſiſters."

After this Francis ſent his chief diſciples into diſtant countries, with a number of companions, taking for himſelf and twelve others, the miſſion of Syria and Egypt. And they went forth with the ſpirit of confeſſors and martyrs; for when men expoſe themſelves to almoſt certain death, there cannot be a doubt of their being in earneſt. Two of his miſſionaries going to Africa endeavoured to go into a moſque; and preaching in the ſtreets, and putting themſelves in the way of the king, he firſt ordered them to be confined; but as they continued their importunity, he was ſo much enraged, that he ſtruck off their heads with his own hands, while they ſuffered with the greateſt reſignation. Francis himſelf went to Egypt, during the ſiege of Da-

Damiata, and getting access to the sultan, he offered to go into the fire in proof of the truth of his religion. But the sultan, who heard him with great patience, did not chuse to put him to that test; but admiring his courage, dismissed him with much good humour, desiring him to pray to God that he would shew him which religion was most agreeable to him.

In A. D. 1221 seven Franciscans went to Ceuta, to preach to the Moors; but they were soon apprehended, and not yielding to the command of the king to turn Mahometans, they were all beheaded.

In the same year a third order of Franciscans, called *brothers of repentance*, was instituted by St. Anthony of Padua. His original name was Ferdinand, and he was a native of Lisbon in Portugal. Many persons expressing their desire to embrace the order, he was unwilling to dissolve so many regular marriages, and dispeople the country; and therefore he gave them a rule, according to which they might serve God in a similar manner in their houses, living in some measure like monks, but without austerity. This was confirmed by pope Nicolas IV, sixty-eight years after.

St. Anthony was many years minister provincial of the Franciscans in Romania, and greatly distinguished himself by preaching on the subject

of

of morals, and in the controverſy with the heretics. It is ſaid that the ſociety of Flagellants began from his preaching. In A. D. 1221 he fixed himſelf at Padua, where he ſometimes preached in the open air to thirty thouſand perſons, who came from all the neighbouring towns. His diſcourſes had a wonderful effect in converting proſtitutes, delivering priſoners, reconciling enemies, procuring the reſtitution of uſury, and the remiſſion of debts. He preached every day. He died this year at the age of thirty ſix, ten of which he had paſſed among the Franciſcans, and he was canonized the year following.

The rule of the Franciſcans was not fully confirmed till the 9th of November A. D. 1213, when it was done by a bull of pope Nicolas III. Beſides engaging to live in obedience to their ſuperior, in chaſtity, and without any property, they vowed obedience to the pope, and his ſucceſſors. And certainly both the orders of mendicants were of much greater uſe in the ſupport of the papal hierarchy, and combating heretics, than all the orders of monks had ever been. Indeed, ſuch was the number of perſons in this period diſaffected to the ſee of Rome, that it is very doubtful whether, without this ſeaſonable aſſiſtance, it could have been ſupported at all.

St.

St. Francis pretended that the particulars of his rule were dictated to him word for word by God himself. But even this is not near so extraordinary a circumstance as what is related of him in the last period of his life. In A. D. 1224, two years before his death, he retired to mount Alverne in the confines of Tuscany, in order to pass the Easter, when he pretended to see in a vision the appearance of Christ upon the cross, descending from heaven. But being awake from his vision, he found all the marks of crucifixion on his own body. His hands and feet were actually pierced with nails, or something resembling nails, the heads being within, and the points clenched on the other side; and on his right side was a red scar, as by a lance, from which there often oozed a quantity of blood, which stained his clothes. This remarkable history is contained in the life of St. Francis written by Bonaventure, who declares that pope Alexander IV asserted in a public discourse, which he himself heard, that he had seen those marks. Many other persons are said to have attested the same on oath, tho' while he lived he endeavoured, thro' modesty, to conceal them. But when he died, which was October 4th, A. D. 1226, many persons saw and examined the wounds, when the nails were still in them, and moveable in the flesh. *Fleury*, Vol. 16. p. 578.

In A. D. 1257 one Ecchard a Dominican preacher in Moravia, aſſerted in a public diſcourſe, that St. Francis had never received the *ſtigmates*, as theſe marks of crucifixion were called, that the Franciſcans were liars, and impoſtors, who invented the ſtory to aſſiſt their begging, and that by the pope's authority he had a power of excommunicating them. But the pope hearing of this, wrote to the ſuperior of the order to ſuſpend that preacher. He alſo wrote to the church at Olmutz, and all the faithful in Germany, to certify the truth of the ſtigmates, as having been the principal motive for the canonization of St. Francis.

Dominic (de Guſman) was born at Calahorra in Arragon, or according to others at Calarvega, in the dioceſe of Oſma in Caſtille, in A. D. 1170. He was the ſon of Felix Guſman, of a noble and antient family. After ſtudying at Palencia, he was made canon, and afterwards archdeacon, of Oſma, and then profeſſor of theology at Placentia. But this employment he quitted to go to preach after the manner of Francis, which he did in ſeveral parts of Spain, in which he gave proof of great zeal and charity, relieving the poor and afflicted. Coming into France with the biſhop of Oſma, he greatly diſtinguiſhed himſelf by preaching againſt the Albigenſes, and there he formed the deſign of inſtituting an order of *preachers*; and for this purpoſe

poſe Fulk biſhop of Thouloufe brought him to the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, that he might be examined by the pope. But before this he had given him and his companions poſſeſſion of a handſome houſe in Thouloufe. He alſo gave him the ſixth part of the tythes of his dioceſe, for the purchaſe of books and ſubſiſtence.

The ſcheme of Dominic being approved by the pope, he conſulted with his followers, when they agreed to adopt the rules of St. Auſtin, but with ſeveral additions; and that they might have no impediment in their preaching, which was their chief object, and from which they were denominated *preaching brothers*, or *predicant friars*, they reſolved to have no eſtates in land, but only revenues. They were then ſixteen in number, and the biſhop of Thouloufe gave them their firſt church, viz. that dedicated to St. Romanus in that city; and near to it he built cloiſters with cells over them, where they might ſtudy and ſleep. Honorius III confirmed the order in A. D. 1216, exempting them from paying tythes of their poſſeſſions, and ordering that they ſhould depend upon the dioceſan for epiſcopal functions; and the prior was to be choſen by the free votes of the brethren; ſo that the Dominicans, at their firſt inſtitution, were not *beggars*, nor exempt from epiſcopal juriſdiction, but canons regular.

The next year Dominic ſent out his followers in pairs, after chuſing a ſuperior, to whom he gave the title of *abbot*; but all the ſucceeding ones were called *maſters*, and the ſuperiors of particular houſes *priors*. He ſent four to Spain, four to Paris, and two more to ſtudy there; and obtaining the houſe of St. James for their church, they were called *Jacobines* thro' France. Hearing of the death of Simon de Montfort at the ſiege of Thouloufe, Dominic went thither to comfort his brethren. Thence, in A. D. 1218, he went into Spain, and founded two monaſteries, one at Madrid, and the other at Segovia. Thence he went to Paris, where he found thirty brethren, and thence to Bologna, where Arnauld, who joined him at Rome, had been very ſucceſsful, and had formed a large ſociety. From this city he went to Rome, and at Parma he met St. Francis; when, after conferring together, they agreed not to accept of church livings. Dominic propoſed to unite the two orders; but Francis thought it would be better that they ſhould keep ſeparate, but in perfect harmony.

In A. D. 1220 Dominic, by the direction of Honorius III, removed all the nuns in Rome, to the number of forty-four, from their ſeveral houſes, much againſt the will of their relations, to the church of St. Sixtus, where they received from his hands a new habit, and promiſed obedience to him;

and

and from this time their relations had no acceſs to them without witneſſes, which ſufficiently implies that thoſe viſits had been the cauſe of much diſorder.

The ſame year Dominic held the firſt chapter general of his order at Bologna, when it was reſolved that the preaching friars ſhould profeſs perfect poverty, and make that the fundamental principle of their order, that they ſhould renounce for ever all eſtates in land, and rents, even thoſe which they had at Thouloufe, the poſſeſſion of which had been ſecured to them by the pope's bull. In this chapter *definiteurs* were appointed with power even over the generals, during the holding of chapters, and it was agreed that theſe chapters ſhould be held every year, at Paris and Bologna alternately. At the ſecond chapter general, held at Bologna, eight *provincials* were choſen, to ſuperintend the preachers in the eight provinces of Spain, France, Lombardy, Romagna, Provence, Germany, Hungary, and England. Preſently after this, viz. Auguſt 26th, A. D. 1221, Dominic died, in the 51ſt year of his age, with great marks of piety; and left his order ſhould be hurt by the maxims of worldly prudence, he forbad, under the curſe of God and his own, the introduction of temporal poſſeſſions into the order. In A. D. 1223 he was canonized.

Theſe preaching friars had ſo much zeal at the firſt, and conſidered preaching as ſo eſſential to their inſtitution, that they were not ſatisfied if they did not exhort at leaſt one perſon every day. Each of them carried with him a copy of the goſpel of Matthew, and of the ſeven canonical epiſtles, according to the expreſs order of Dominic.

On the retreat of the ſtudents and profeſſors from the univerſity of Paris, the Dominicans eſtabliſhed a chair of theology in that city, to the ſucceſs of which the high character of their general Jourdan contributed not a little, as alſo the great number of doctors and ſtudents who had entered into the order. For tho' they had changed their habits, they ſtill gave lectures.

Among the Dominican preachers, one of the moſt diſtinguiſhed in this early period was John of Vicenza. He gained ſo much upon the people of Bologna, that he became maſter of the city. So great was his reputation, that the pope wiſhed to employ him to reconcile the cities that were at variance, and he was obliged to threaten the citizens with eccleſiaſtical cenſures, to compel them to let him go.

Another order of mendicants owes its origin to pope Alexander IV, who united two ſects of hermits, viz. thoſe of *William* and thoſe of *St. Auſtin*, giving

giving them both the appellation of *the Hermits of St. Auſtin.* Theſe, with the Carmelites, made four orders of mendicants. *Moſheim,* Vol. 3. p. 52.

SECTION VII.

Some Particulars relating to both the Orders of Mendicants, and others of a miſcellaneous Nature, concerning them and the Monks.

BOTH the Franciſcans and Dominicans were ſoon found of great uſe to the ſee of Rome, on which account the popes gave them every encouragement, and many privileges; but the ſecular clergy taking umbrage at it, it was ſometimes found neceſſary to reſtrict them.

In A. D. 1254 Innocent IV forbad confeſſion to any prieſt who was a ſtranger, without the permiſſion of the curé. The friars were alſo forbidden to preach during the hour of maſs, leſt they ſhould draw the people from the pariſh churches. If the biſhop himſelf choſe to preach, no friar muſt preach in the ſame place at the ſame time. If any of them buried a perſon, the biſhop, or the curé, was to have a third, or a fourth of the fees. This

bull, however, was revoked by Alexander IV in A. D. 1255. At the ſame time that he reſtored to the univerſity of Paris thoſe doctors of the mendicants who had been excluded by his predeceſſor. However, the ſcholars and the antient members of the univerſity remonſtrated againſt this, and many of them left the univerſity; but the pope paid no regard to their oppoſition.

In A. D. 1256 arbitrators were choſen, who decided that the mendicants ſhould have no more than two ſchools there, ſeparate from thoſe of the ſecular maſters and ſcholars, and that they ſhould renounce all particular privileges. But the pope cancelled this accommodation, and obliged the univerſity to receive the mendicant profeſſors, eſpecially Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventure. They ordered, however, that in all the public acts they ſhould rank after the other profeſſors.

By a bull of pope Martin IV, in A. D. 1282, thoſe perſons who confeſſed to a friar were ordered to confeſs at leaſt once a year to their curé.

The biſhops ſoon took great offence at the privileges granted to the friars, and a council being held on the ſubject at Rheims, in A. D. 1287, it was agreed not to allow them thoſe privileges till they had a ſecond order from Rome; and they ſettled the contribution of each clergyman to proſecute the affair at Rome.

Lewis

Lewis the IX of France was so much attached to the mendicants, that he was determined to resign the government of his kingdom to his son, and become one of them; but his queen dissuaded him from it. He wished that two of his sons and his daughter might embrace that mode of life, and took measures for that purpose, but they did not succeed.

In A. D. 1243 there was a great dispute between the two orders of mendicants which occasioned a great scandal, like that between the knights Templars and Hospitallers in Palestine. The Dominicans said, "We wear a more decent dress." The Franciscans replied, "We have for the love of God "embraced a more austere and humble life, and "are consequently more holy." The Dominicans answered, "It is true that you go barefooted, ill "dressed, and girded with a rope, but you are not "forbidden, as we are, to eat flesh meat, even in "public, and to make good cheer."

The great favour shewn to the mendicants, especially by Lewis IX, excited the jealousy of the secular clergy, and of the monks, who said they loved the tables of princes and prelates, and to get posts of honour; that they meddled with public business, entering into the councils of lords and prelates, and sitting with them in courts of judicature. On the other hand the superior zeal and

literature of the mendicants made them despise the monks, as idle and useless.

In the letters of Peter de Vignes, secretary of the emperor Frederic, there is one, written in the name of the clergy, and seemingly addressed to the emperor, containing heavy complaints against the mendicants. "They declaim against us," they say, "in their sermons, and have diminished our "rights so much, that we are reduced to nothing. "Whereas before we commanded princes, and "made the people fear us, we are now a laughing "flock to them; they engross all our advantages "from penances, baptisms, the anointing of the "sick, and the burial of the dead."

According to Matthew Paris, the mendicants abused their privileges of preaching and confessing, exposing the ignorance of the secular clergy; and the parishioners chusing to confess to these itinerants, rather than to their own clergy, sinners were under less restraint. The superiority assumed by the mendicants had, however, one good effect. The monks being despised by the friars for their ignorance, Stephen de Lexington an Englishman established a college for the Cistercian monks in Paris, which was the origin of the college of Bernardines there.

Before the year A. D. 1289 the Franciscans had fallen into great disorder, when Raimond Goffredi of

of Provence was made their general, the preceding general after he was made a cardinal, having lived like a prince; so that they were far removed from the state of poverty recommended by their founder. They received money at the first masses of new priests, they had chests placed in churches to receive money for masses, they attended anniversaries for the dead for a certain sum, like the secular priests; they placed at the doors of their churches little boys, who took money of passengers, and offered them little candles to sell, and burn them in honour of the saints; the friars themselves trafficked in the streets and markets, taking with them little children, who received the money; they abandoned their solitary and poor houses, to build handsome ones, at a great expence in cities, in which those of the place lived to the exclusion of strangers, and none of them would remove far from their country or relations.

In A. D. 1256 William de St. Amour wrote a book intitled, *The dangers of the latter days*, in which, without naming them, he inveighed bitterly against the mendicants, as unauthorized preachers, and dangerous to the church. But pope Alexander IV condemned the book, ordering it to be burned within eight days by any person who had a copy of it, under pain of excommunication. This work of St. Amour was answered at large by Thomas Aquinas. In

In A. D. 1269 there arose a controversy of some note between Gerard of Abbeville a doctor in Paris, and Bonaventure, about the principles of the mendicants; the former objecting to them, and the latter defending them. Gerard said it was ridiculous to pretend to have no property in things which are consumed in the use. "To whom," says he, "belongs the money which you amass "from all quarters, if you have nothing even in "common." Bonaventure replied, "It is to the "pope, and the church of Rome, that the proper-"ty of all that is given to us belongs. We have "nothing but the use of it. We are with respect "to the pope what children in the family are with "respect to their father, who receive nothing but "the property of it passes immediately to him."

In A. D. 1279 pope Nicolas III published a declaration of the institute of St. Francis, answering the objections that had been made to it, and authorizing the reasoning of Bonaventure; saying that the property of what was given to the friars belonged to the pope and the church of Rome, that the places allotted them for their habitations always belonged to those who gave them; and that the property of money given them is in the same state, till it be actually converted into necessaries. In answer to the objection that had been made to them, as not labouring as at the first, he said, that bodi-

ly

ly labour might be dispensed with in the case of those who applied themselves to higher duties. He observed, however, that friars must not preach without the leave of the diocesan bishop, except by order of the holy see. Lastly he forbad any person to write or preach against the rule of St. Francis.

In this period there arose a kind of spurious mendicants, calling themselves *Apostolics*, the founder of whom was Gerard Segarelle, a native of Parma, wholly illiterate, and of little understanding. Not being able to get admitted among the Franciscans, and seeing the pictures of the apostles as they are commonly drawn in churches, he imitated their dress; and selling all that he had, gave the money to the poor. Numbers joining him, they spread themselves thro' all parts of Europe; but being charged with many disorders, and also with holding heretical opinions, tho' they are not named, they were suppressed by pope Honorius in A. D. 1285, and again by Innocent IV in A. D. 1290; and Segarelle being apprehended, was burned at Parma in July A. D. 1300.

Notwithstanding repeated decrees of councils against the appointment of *new religious*, as they were called, or new orders of persons peculiarly devoted to what was then called religion, several new orders, and some of note, besides those of the mendicants, were instituted in this period.

In

In A. D. 1206 Albert bishop of Riga instituted a military order called the *brothers of Christ*, also *brothers of the sword*, the object of which was the defence of the newly converted Christians of those parts against their heathen neighbours. But after a great defeat of these knights, and of many crusaders who had joined them in A. D. 1236, they united themselves to the Teutonic knights, and the pope published a bull for that purpose in A. D. 1237. To these Teutonic knights duke Conrad in A. D. 1226 had given the territory of Culm, and all the lands they should conquer from the infidels in Prussia.

During the crusades against the Albigenses, many women in Flanders, at the head of whom was Mary de Oigres, devoted themselves to works of labour and charity; those of them that were married persuading their husbands to live in continence, at least in part; and this they did notwithstanding the ridicule to which they were exposed. An account of them is given by Philip de Vitri, who assisted them by his preaching.

In A. D. 1213 the order of *Mercy* was founded, for the redemption of Christian captives.

At the council of Lyons in A. D. 1274 new orders of monks were forbidden, and some that had been lately formed were suppressed; but this was expressly said not to include the two orders of Domini-

minicans and Franciſcans, on account of their evident utility to the univerſal church. However, the order of *Servants of the virgin Mary*, commonly called *Servites*, inſtituted at Florence thirty-ſeven years before, was confirmed.

The mendicants it is ſuppoſed deviſed the ſcenical repreſentation of religious ſubjects in churches, intended to give the common people ſome knowledge of ſcripture hiſtory, and intereſt them in it; but they ſerved to turn the whole ſubject into ridicule with perſons of ſenſe. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 107.

SECTION VIII.

The Hiſtory of the Albigenſes.

IN the preceding period of this hiſtory we have ſeen the great progreſs that was made by perſons who held ſeveral manichean principles, together with others that were hoſtile to the church of Rome, aiming at the ſubverſion of the whole hierarchy, in the ſouthern provinces of France. As they were moſt numerous in the neighbourhood of Albi, or as ſome ſay becauſe their tenets were condemned in a council held in that city,

(but

(but the greateſt part of Narbonne Gaul was ſometimes called *Albigeſium*. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 119.) they at length got the appellation of *Albigenſes*,* tho' there were among them others who held none of their manichean principles, and who were called *Wal-*

* To the account of the Albigenſes, p. 113, add the following particulars. After a ceremony correſponding to that of *extreme unction*, but in which no uſe was made of oil, they thought it neceſſary that the ſubject ſhould die; and therefore when he might have recovered, they enjoined what was called *endura*, or a voluntary death, generally by refuſing all food. This favoured of their manicheiſm.

After another ceremony, which was generally termed *ſpiritual baptism*, by which ſome of them were admitted into the claſs of the *perfect*, it was deemed unlawful to touch, or to be touched by, a woman, even the neareſt relation.

They had a peculiar mode of ſalutation, and peculiar ceremonies at their meals, by which they were diſtinguiſhed from other Chriſtians.

They maintained that all bodily puniſhment, and eſpecially that of death, was unlawful. See *Limborch's History of the Inquisition by Chandler*, p. 42. &c. Tho' theſe circumſtances and others were made uſe of in courts of judicature, in order to aſcertain whether any perſon belonged to the ſect, little account would have been made of them if they had not denied the authority of the church of Rome.

Waldenſes, having come chiefly from the vallies of Piedmont. Theſe heretics, as they were called, were now become ſo numerous and powerful, ſupported by the lords of the country, and among them by Raimond IV count of Thouloufe, and Raimond Roger V count of Foix, that the court of Rome was ſeriouſly alarmed; and hence aroſe a religious war, the moſt deſtructive of men of any that we read of in the annals of the Chriſtian church, the particulars of which I ſhall now recite.

In order to oppoſe the progreſs of theſe heretics, pope Innocent III firſt ſent two legates, Peter de Caſtelnau, and Raoul, both Ciſtercian monks, in A. D. 1204; who coming to Thouloufe, endeavoured to perſuade the people to drive the heretics out of the city. This they promiſed, but very little was effected, as the heretics held their aſſemblies by night. And it ſoon appearing that they were not to be ſuppreſſed without force, the pope applied to Philip Auguſtus king of France, to aſſiſt his legates, and employ his arms in defence of the church. In the mean time the perſecution was carried on againſt the heretics in various parts of France, and in A. D. 1205 ſeveral were burned at Braine in the dioceſe of Rheims, and among them one Nicolas, a famous painter.

The legates were afterwards joined by the biſhop of Oſma from Spain, accompanied by Do-

minic, whoſe hiſtory has been given in a ſeparate ſection. But one of the legates, viz. Peter de Caſtelnau, having excommunicated the count of Thouloufe, was murdered as he was leaving the country, but it was never diſcovered by whom. The pope being informed of it, wrote on the 1ſt of March A. D. 1208 to all the lords in the ſouthern parts of France, treating Peter as a martyr, informing them that he had ordered the clergy to redouble their zeal againſt the heretics, and that he had excommunicated the murderers, and all their accomplices. But the proper object of his letter was to urge them to join their forces againſt the heretics; and for this purpoſe he promiſed remiſſion of ſins to all who ſhould revenge the innocent blood that had been ſhed. He farther ſaid, that, as the count of Thouloufe had been juſtly ſuſpected of the murder, he had ordered him to be again excommunicated; adding that, ſince, according to the canons, "faith is not to be kept with "thoſe who keep no faith with God," he abſolved from their oath of fealty all perſons who had taken it to him, and permitted any Catholic to ſeize his lands, with a view to purge them of all hereſy. Not content with this exhortation, addreſſed to the neighbours of the count, the pope publiſhed a plenary indulgence to all who would take the croſs, in order to exterminate the heretics of Languedoc.

guedoc. Accordingly, it was taken by great numbers, who wore it on their breaſts, to diſtinguiſh themſelves from the other cruſaders.

In the mean time, the count ſent to the pope to inform him that his legates had acted with too much harſhneſs; that however he was innocent of the murder, and ready to make any ſubmiſſion that ſhould be required of him, if he would ſend a proper perſon for the purpoſe. Accordingly the pope ſent Milon, one of his clergy, who ordered the count to attend him at Valence, and there made him promiſe to deliver ſeven of his caſtles, which he did from a dread of the great army of cruſaders which he ſaw was ready to pour upon him; and having done this, he was abſolved, but in a manner that was very humiliating, having been brought June 18th, A. D. 1209, to the door of the church in his ſhirt, and taken an oath to obey all the orders of the pope, with reſpect to every thing for which he had been excommunicated. He alſo thought it neceſſary to deſire the legate to give the croſs to himſelf.

By this time the cruſaders were aſſembled from all quarters at the feſtival of St. John, and at the head of them was Peter archbiſhop of Sens, and ſeveral other prelates, Eudes III duke of Burgundy, Simon of Montfort, and other lay lords. Taking the count of Thouloufe along with them, they

proceeded to Beziers; and the inhabitants deſpiſing their ſummons, they took it by aſſault, and after putting all they found in it to the ſword, they ſet fire to the city, July 22d. It was ſuppoſed that ſeven thouſand perſons were ſlain in the churches in which they had taken refuge. In the next place they went to Carcaſſone, the inhabitants of which ſurrendered to them, on condition of leaving the place in their ſhirts, which accordingly they did Auguſt 5th.

On the 6th of September, a great council was held at Avignon, where it was ordered that the biſhops ſhould preach oftener than they had done, ſince to their negligence was attributed the increaſe of hereſy, and the corruption of manners. The citizens of Thouloufe were excommunicated for not having expelled the heretics from their city, and the count, if he ſhould revive certain taxes which he had renounced. At the ſame time all the relations of the murderers of Peter de Caſtelnau, to the third generation, were rendered incapable of any eccleſiaſtical benefice.

The next year, towards the end of June, Simon de Montfort beſieged the caſtle of Minorbe in the dioceſe of Carcaſſone, promiſing thoſe who held it their lives, on condition of their converſion. But thoſe of them who were of the rank of *perfect*, men and women, rejected the propoſal with great indig-

indignation; and when the fire was lighted to burn them, they went into it of their own accord. Theſe were about an hundred and forty. The reſt abjured their hereſy. Many of the biſhops of France engaged in this war, and with them was William of Paris, an excellent engineer, who contributed materially to the taking of the caſtle of Carcaſſone. Towards the end of this year, the count of Thouloufe applied to the pope with great humility for the reſtoration of his ſeven caſtles; but being ſtill ſuſpected of the murder of Peter de Caſtelnau, and alſo of hereſy, two perſons were appointed to receive his juſtification; and after a public hearing before a council aſſembled in Provence, his ſincerity being ſuſpected, he was again excommunicated.

About the middle of lent, A. D. 1211, the biſhop of Paris went to Carcaſſone, with many other cruſaders, and ſoon after the biſhops of Liſieux and Bayeux, during the ſiege of Lavour, which was taken by aſſault May 3d. They took out of it Aimeri of Montreal, and other knights, to the number of eighty, whom the count of Montfort ordered to be hanged; but the gallows breaking, he ordered them to be put to the ſword, which the pilgrims were eager to execute. At the ſame time they burned three hundred, and by the order of the count they threw into a pit the ſiſter of Aimeri, called an obſtinate heretic, and buried her

with ſtones. They then took a caſtle called Cuper, and the biſhops not being able to convert any of them, the pilgrims burned about ſixty with great exultation.

At this time the biſhop of Thouloufe would have had an ordination in the city, but he could not do it becauſe the count was in a ſtate of excommunication. He, therefore, requeſted that he would go out till the ceremony was over. But he not only refuſed, but inſiſted on the biſhop leaving the place under pain of death, and with this order he was, after ſome time, obliged to comply. His clergy alſo left the city, walking barefoot, and carrying the hoſt. The biſhop afterwards formed the citizens into confraternities, for the extirpation of heretics and uſurpers, in order that they might have the benefit of the ſame indulgences that were granted to the cruſaders. The inhabitants of the ſuburbs alſo formed a ſeparate confraternity, and favouring the heretics, they often fought with each other. At length, however, tho' with ſome difficulty, the count engaged both of them (tho' thoſe of the city had been concerned in the ſiege of Lavour) to unite, and defend the city againſt Montfort, who threatened it with a ſiege; and in conſequence of this, the biſhop excommunicated them all.

In

In July Montfort, with the aſſiſtance of a large reinforcement, by the arrival of the count of Bar in Lorrain, and many of the German nobility, actually laid ſiege to Thouloufe; but not having troops enow, he ſoon raiſed the ſiege. After this the biſhop of Cohors invited Montfort to take poſſeſſion of his city, which belonged to the count, and there he was received. But many of the places which he had taken revolted from him, and many of the cruſaders, after they had ſerved the forty days, which was all that their vow engaged them to do, left him, and both thoſe inconveniences frequently happened in the courſe of this war.

In the following winter William archdeacon of Paris, and James de Vitri, and of Argenteueil, joined by the biſhop of Thouloufe, preaching the cruſade thro' France and Germany, gave the croſs to prodigious numbers. Alſo Gui biſhop of Carcaſſone, and many other biſhops, were indefatigable in promoting the war, calling it the war of Jeſus Chriſt.

In A. D. 1213 the count of Thouloufe, finding that he could not do better, made over his eſtates to his brother in law, Alphonſo king of Arragon, who thereupon wrote to the pope, complaining of the harſh treatment of the count, and begging that his eſtates might be reſerved for his ſon, then only fifteen years of age; and alſo that he would accept

of the penance of the count himſelf, who was ready to ſerve againſt the Saracens, either beyond ſea or in Spain. Upon this the pope, unwilling to have any difference with the king, wrote to count Montfort, to reſtore to the king what he had taken from the count; and a council was held at Lavour for the purpoſe of making terms with the king. But not coming to any agreement, Alphonſo acted openly in defence of the Albigenſes, tho' appealing to the pope. On the repreſentation of the legates, the pope required the king to abandon the people of Thouloufe, in the mean time ordering a truce between him, and the count of Montfort, who, however, paying no regard to this requiſition, challenged the count, ſo that the war continued all the ſummer.

In February this year, Lewis, the ſon of the king of France, took the croſs againſt the Albigenſes, and after his example many knights; but his war with the king of England obliged him to aſſiſt his father; and the cruſade for the holy land took off ſo many, that Montfort was almoſt abandoned, when he was joined by two brothers Manaſſey biſhop of Orleans, and William biſhop of Auxerre, with as many troops as they could collect. With this reinforcement he marched to Carcaſſone, and on the 10th of September, having made preparations to beſiege Muret, the cruſaders made a peculiarly

liarly ſolemn preparation for battle. The biſhop of Thouloufe advancing with his mitre on his head, and what was ſuppoſed to be the true croſs of Chriſt in his hand, all the cruſaders alighted from their horſes, and one by one adored it; when the biſhop of Comminges, ſeeing that this method would take up too much time, took the croſs in his hand, and from an elevated ſituation gave the whole army his ſolemn benediction, ſaying, "Go in the "name of Jeſus Chriſt, I will be your ſurety at "the day of judgment, that whoever dies in this "battle ſhall receive the eternal glory of martyr-"dom, without paſſing thro' purgatory;" and the other biſhops preſent confirmed what he ſaid. Inflamed by this ceremony, and theſe declarations, the army, previouſly arranged in three bodies, in honour of the trinity, advanced againſt the enemy, while the biſhops and the reſt of the clergy went into a neighbouring church, where they prayed with a loud voice for the combatants. Theſe meaſures had the deſired effect. They obtained a complete victory, and the king of Arragon was killed in the battle.

In the middle of April A. D. 1214 there arrived a freſh army of cruſaders, conducted by the biſhop of Carcaſſone, the general rendezvous being at Beziers in Eaſter. And in the courſe of this ſummer the count of Montfort took ſeveral caſtles in

Quercy and Agenois, and among them Muriac, where they found ſeven of the Waldenſes, whom the cruſaders burned with great joy. Theſe conqueſts being made by the cruſaders, the pope's legate claimed them, as belonging to the pope; and the ſon of Lewis not objecting to it, the pope gave the guardianſhip of all the conquered places to Montfort, till the meeting of a general council in November following. In the Chriſtmas of this year, count Baldwin, brother of the count of Thouloufe, was taken by treachery, and after cruel uſage was hanged by the order of his brother.

At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, the count of Thouloufe, accompanied by his ſon, and the count of Foix, claimed the reſtitution of their eſtates, of which they had been deprived by the cruſaders; but they were confirmed to the count of Montfort, and Raimond was only allowed a penſion of four hundred marks of ſilver. It was, however, agreed that the places which had not yet been conquered ſhould be reſerved for his ſon, when he ſhould be of age. This youth being thus favoured, ſeveral cities revolted from Montfort, particularly Avignon, Marſeilles, St. Gilles, Beaucaire, and Tarraſcon.

In the mean time the father, who had been in Spain, had taken poſſeſſion of Thouloufe, while Montfort had been engaged in the war againſt the revolted

revolted cities, in September A. D. 1217. The pope, alarmed at this, exerted himself to the utmoſt to recover it, and wrote to the king of France to engage his aſſiſtance. Accordingly Montfort advanced to the ſiege of Thouloufe, but after lying before it nine months, he was killed in a ſally of the beſieged June 25th, A. D. 1218. Amauri his ſon, who ſucceeded him in the command, raiſed the ſiege a month after, many of the cruſaders having returned home, and many of the people of the country having quitted his party, and joined the enemy. Dominic, hearing of the death of Montfort, left Rome, to go and comfort his brethren.

This event was ſeverely felt by the cruſaders, and the pope, who immediately ſent legates to the king of France, to engage him to compromiſe his differences with the king of England, and march againſt the heretics. But nothing was effected of a conſiderable time, and the count of Thouloufe died in peaceable poſſeſſion of the city, and with all the marks of a good catholic, tho' in a ſtate of excommunication. He was ſucceeded by his ſon Raimond VIII, then twenty-five years of age, who continued the war againſt Amauri de Montfort; but being afraid of Lewis, the ſon of Philip Auguſtus, he made his peace, and was abſolved from his excommunication; promiſing, at a council held

held at Montpelier Auguſt 26th, A. D. 1224, to adhere to the catholic faith of the church of Rome, and cauſe it to be profeſſed in all his ſtates, alſo to repair the injury that had been done to the church, and pay twenty-five thouſand marks of ſilver, provided the pope would diſcharge him from the pretenſions of the count de Montfort. This he confirmed by oath, which was alſo taken by Roger count de Foix, and the count of Beziers.

In A. D. 1226, Amauri, having now no other reſource, ſurrendered to Lewis VIII all his right to the eſtates of the count of Thouloufe, and then the king took the croſs, with almoſt all the biſhops and barons of his kingdom, in order wholly to exterminate the Albigenſes. At the ſame time preachers were ſent into all the provinces, to publiſh a plenary indulgence to all who would go on the expedition; and the pope's legate, with the conſent of the biſhops, promiſed the king a hundred thouſand livres a year for five years, with a tenth of the levies upon the clergy, and that if this ſhould not be ſufficient, the remainder of his expences ſhould be paid out of the treaſury of the church.

Encouraged by this, the king appointed a meeting of the cruſaders at Bourges the fourth ſunday in Eaſter, and in the ſpring of the year A. D. 1226, he attended at the place, from which he proceeded to Lyons. Every place received him till he came

to

to Avignon, which he beſieged, and took after two months by compoſition, when there had been a great mortality both in the city and among the beſiegers, who loſt there two thouſand men. After this the king went to Montpenſier in Auvergne, where he died November 8th. However, the army, now commanded by Imbert de Beaujeu, marched to Thouloufe, and made ſuch deſtruction in the neighbourhood, that the count liſtened to a propoſal of peace; agreeing to meet at Meaux the year following to ſettle the terms of it. There the count was reconciled to the church, promiſing to make ſtrict inquiry after the heretics within his eſtates, and drive them out of them; and for a penance he took the croſs to ſerve five years againſt the Saracens. He gave his only daughter in marriage to the brother of the king of France, who, if he had no children, was to inherit all his eſtates. In April the count received abſolution at the hands of the pope's legate, after being led to the altar barefooted, with only his ſhirt and drawers on.

Thus ended this deſtructive war, to the extirpation of the Albigenſes, as far as outward force could do it; and what was left undone in this way was immediately taken up by the inquiſition, more deſtructive than the war itſelf. By an ordonance of the king of France, heretics condemned by the biſhops of any place were to be puniſhed without delay.

delay. It was declared to be infamous, and punishable by confiscation of goods, to conceal them, and two silver marks were promised to any person who would apprehend one of them.

One castle, however, Montsegur in the diocese of Thoulouse, afforded a retreat for some of the Albigenses, and was looked upon to be impregnable. But in A. D. 1243 it was taken by Durand the bishop of Albi, and the seneschal of Carcassone; who finding in it two hundred persons who refused to recant, burned them all; and this was properly the last exploit in the war.

In A. D. 1249 this last count of Thoulouse died, the family being then extinct, which was considered by the catholics as a judgment for the protection they had given to the heretics. However a little before his death he had caused more than eighty heretics to be burned at Agen.

SECTION

SECTION IX.

Of the Progreſs of the Inquiſition, and the State of Hereſy in other Countries beſides France.

A MORE effectual engine for the extinction of hereſy than open war, was the *court of inquiſition* which was gradually introduced into a great part of Europe; but it was not till after this period of our hiſtory, that it was fully eſtabliſhed, and the forms of proceeding in it ſettled; nor was it wholly independent of the temporal powers, as it afterwards came to be. It will be proper, however, to give an account of the progreſs that was made towards the eſtabliſhment of this horrid tribunal, in the methods of proceeding againſt heretics during the courſe of the preceding war, and for ſome time ſubſequent to it.

At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, the moſt rigorous decrees were made againſt heretics, and all who favoured them, and alſo againſt thoſe princes and lords who did not purge their eſtates of them.

In A. D. 1224 the emperor Frederic II publiſhed a ſevere conſtitution againſt heretics, engaging to execute the ſentence of the church againſt them.

them. They who recanted thro' fear of death were to be impriſoned for life, and they who relapſed after recanting were to be put to death. The heretics were allowed no appeal from their ſentence, and as in this ordonance it is ſaid that, "this crime, which attacks God himſelf, is greater "than that of high treaſon," the children of heretics to the third generation were to be excluded from all beneſices temporal or ſpiritual, unleſs they informed againſt their parents. It was alſo ordered that the preaching friars, who were ſent againſt the heretics, ſhould be under the emperor's ſpecial protection. In a ſecond conſtitution of the ſame emperor, the Paterins were condemned to the flames. * In a third he copied four canons of the preceding council of Lateran, inſerting temporal puniſhments inſtead of excommunication.

As it was probable that many perſons did not care to inform againſt their neighbours, it was provided at the council of Narbonne in A. D. 1227, that in every pariſh the biſhops ſhould have ſynodal witneſſes, whoſe buſineſs it ſhou'd be to make inquiry concerning hereſy, and report it. After this another council was held at Thouloufe, the

* This F. Paul ſays was the firſt law that enjoined the puniſhment of heretics by death. *History of the Inquiſition*, p. 10.

the object of which was the extirpation of herefy. Among other provifions that were here made for that purpofe, all men above fourteen years of age, and women above twelve, were required to fwear before a bifhop, or his delegate, that they renounced all herefy, and that they would inquire after, and inform againft, all heretics. This oath was to be renewed every two years. All perfons alfo were required to come to confeffion, and receive the eucharift three times in every year; and if any perfons did not do this, they were to be fufpected of herefy. By a decree of the fame council, laymen were not allowed to have any copy of the fcriptures, but only a *pfalter*, a *breviary*, and the *hours of the bleffed virgin*, and thefe in Latin; which is the firft inftance of any prohibition of the kind.

The firft perfons who were commiffioned to make this inquiry concerning herefy were two Dominicans, who conducted themfelves with fo much rigour in the condemnation of fome heretics at Thoulouſe, that they were obliged to leave the city, together with all of the fame order, and the bifhop himfelf. Afterwards, in order to moderate their violence, they had a colleague given them of the Franciſcan order; but this not anfwering the purpofe, orders were diſpatched from Rome ſuſpending this inquifition a long time.

However, the buſineſs of the extermination of heretics did not ſtop. In May 13th, A. D. 1239, one hundred and eighty-three heretics were burned at Monthemé in Champaign, in the preſence of the king of Navarre, and the barons of the country, the archbiſhop of Rheims, and ſeventeen biſhops. "It was," ſays Alberic, an author of that time, "a burnt offering well pleaſing to God." Robert, a Dominican, who pronounced the condemnation of theſe heretics, was formerly one of them. He afterwards diſcovered many others; but at length, impoſing upon the goodneſs of king Lewis, and abuſing his authority as an inquiſitor, accuſing the innocent with the guilty, his commiſſion was taken from him by the pope, and he was condemned to perpetual impriſonment.

It was not till the council of Beziers in A. D. 1246 that ſuch regulations were made as ſerved for a foundation for the proceedings of the inquiſition afterwards. The preaching friars, or Dominicans, who were the inquiſitors, were then ordered to make proclamation in certain places, for all heretics to come and make their ſubmiſſion for themſelves, and inform againſt others within a limited time, under the penalty of death, perpetual impriſonment, exile, or confiſcation of goods, according to circumſtances; but thoſe who being accuſed would not confeſs their faults, were to be con-

condemned without mercy, even tho' they ſubmitted to the will of the church. At the ſame time it was ordered that all the priſoners ſhould be confined ſeparately; and that all the goods of priſoners were to be confiſcated. At the ſame council it was decreed that none of the laity ſhould have any books of divinity, not even in Latin, and the clergy none in the vulgar tongue.

At the requeſt of Lewis IX of France, pope Alexander IV appointed two mendicant friars to be inquiſitors for the kingdom of France, except the eſtates of the count of Thouloufe; but they were not to ſentence to perpetual impriſonment, without the conſent of the dioceſan biſhops. By a conſtitution of the ſame pope, addreſſed to the inquiſitors of the mendicant orders, they were to demand of thoſe heretics who returned to the church a pecuniary ſecurity that they would remain there. He alſo ordered that the goods of all heretics that were confiſcated ſhould be reſerved for the uſe of the church of Rome.

It is evident that heretics abounded in the northern parts of Italy, almoſt as much as in the ſouthern provinces of France, eſpecially during the conteſts between the popes and the emperors of Germany, who always claimed that part of Italy. At Viterbo, in A. D. 1207, two of the conſuls, and alſo the treaſurer, who had long been in a ſtate

of excommunication, were Patarins; but then pope Innocent III went to that city on purpoſe to drive them out. The citizens complied with his wiſhes, and having aſſembled a great council of biſhops, abbots, counts, barons, &c. &c. from all the cities of Tuſcany, and the eſtates of the church, he publiſhed a conſtitution, by which all heretics, eſpecially the Patarins, who ſhould be found in the patrimony of St. Peter, ſhould have their goods confiſcated; the houſes which had received them were to be demoliſhed, ſo as never to be rebuilt, and their adherents to be puniſhed with the confiſcation of the fourth part of their goods. It was alſo ordered that they ſhould have no acceſs to any court of juſtice, be incapable of any public employment, and be deprived of the rights of Chriſtian burial.

In A. D. 1225 pope Honorius III complained that in the city of Breſſe the heretics were ſo inſolent, that they armed themſelves againſt the Catholics, fortified ſome caſtles, and burned the churches. They even threw down lamps by way of excommunicating the church of Rome, and thoſe who favoured its doctrines. He therefore ordered their caſtles to be demoliſhed, ſo that they ſhould not be rebuilt.

About the year A. D. 1250 Peter of Verona, who had been born of heretical parents, becoming a Do-

a Dominican, was peculiarly active in the diſcovery and proſecution of heretics in Italy. At Florence he engaged ſeveral of the nobility to take a ſtandard marked with a croſs, and coming to an engagement with a number of heretics, near the river Arno, he defeated them and drove them out of the city. This Peter Innocent IV made inquiſitor for Cremona, Milan, and all that neighbourhood. But ſome time after this he was murdered by a perſon who afterwards entered into the order of the Dominicans himſelf. At this time, the conteſt with the emperors being over, the popes exerted themſelves without obſtruction for the ſuppreſſion of hereſy in Italy.

It was not till A. D. 1251 that the tribunal of the inquiſition was fully eſtabliſhed, when it was contrived by Innocent IV to take the cognizance of hereſy out of the hands both of the biſhops, and the civil magiſtrate, the biſhop being aſſociated with the inquiſitor, but ſo as to have no real power, and the civil magiſtrates being allowed one third of the fines. The priſons were kept at the expence of the public. This court was firſt eſtabliſhed in Lombardy, Romagna, and Marca Treviſana, which abounded with heretics, and where the popes had moſt power. The eſtabliſhment of this court, however, met with much oppoſition, even

in Italy, and much more in other countries. *Giannone*, Vol. 2. p. 60.

The bull of Innocent not being eaſily received, Alexander IV in A. D. 1259 renewed it, but with ſome modification. It was again renewed by Clement IV in A. D. 1265. But even then it was not fully executed, ſo that four ſucceeding popes were employed in overcoming the difficulties that prevented its being carried into effect. Theſe aroſe from the exceſſive ſeverity of the inquiſitors, and the objections of the laity to bear the expence of this new tribunal. In order to remove theſe difficulties the pope gave more power to the biſhops, and had the expence borne in ſome different manner. *F. Paul's Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*, p. 12.

The proceedings in this court were at firſt very ſimple, and reſembled thoſe of other tribunals; but they were afterwards intirely new modelled by the Dominicans, who were generally made inquiſitors, and who knowing nothing of the common law, regulated all their proceedings according to the rules of *penance*, which were framed ſo as to correſpond with the maxims of the government of God, to whom every ſinner muſt confeſs his ſin before he can expect to be forgiven. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 116.

Beſides the caſe of hereſy, the inquiſitors took cogniſance of magic, ſorcery, witchcraft, and Judaiſm where it was not tolerated. Ib. p. 115.

SECTION

SECTION X.

Of the Intercourſe between the Greek and Latin Churches.

THE conqueſt of Conſtantinople by the Latins was as far from promoting any proper union of the two churches, as it was from being any aſſiſtance towards recovering the holy land. Inſignificant as were the points in diſpute between them, their antipathy to each other was great, and had now been of long ſtanding. The war, or the conſequences of it, had not contributed to leſſen this animoſity; and leaſt of all on the ſide of Greeks, whoſe abhorrence of the Latins was much increaſed by the inſolence and licentiouſneſs of both the laity and clergy among them. They alſo deſpiſed them for their barbarous manners, and want of literature; and this effect continued after the cauſe was now in a great meaſure removed. For certainly, in this period, the Latin church produced more able and learned writers than the Greek; but the latter had no knowledge of them. Since, however, a deſire on the part of the pope and the Latin clergy to derive a revenue from the Eaſt, and a deſire of aſſiſtance on the part of the

Greek emperors, made both parties frequently wiſh for a compromiſe of their differences, and a good deal was done with a view to it, it will be proper to relate the particulars.

The firſt attempt that was made in this period to bring the two churches to greater union was occaſioned by ſome friars viſiting Germanus the Greek patriarch in A. D. 1233; and as John Ducas, the Greek emperor at Nice, was then in fear of an attack from the Latin emperor at Conſtantinople, and the cruſaders, he favoured a conference between them for that purpoſe; and in conſequence of this ſome letters paſſed between pope Gregory IX and Germanus, each vindicating his own church; and the next year two Dominicans and two Franciſcans arriving at Nice, to treat concerning the union, they were honourably received, and entertained at the expence of the emperor.

After ſeveral days paſſed in formal conference, and much ſubtle diſputation, about the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit, the Greeks, being much ſurprized at the acuteneſs of the friars, and eſpecially their ready quotation of the Greek Fathers, deſired to refer the treaty to a regular council; and that till this could be convened, the nuncios ſhould remain at Conſtantinople; and the Greek emperor, unwilling to give up all expectation from the conference, with ſome difficulty perſuaded them to wait

wait for it. Accordingly it was fixed for Eaſter at Nympheum. In the whole of this previous conference the nuncios behaved with all the newly acquired haughtineſs of the court of Rome, conſidering the Greeks as having, without any juſt reaſon, withdrawn themſelves from their obedience to the pope, and requiring abſolute ſubmiſſion to the doctrine and diſcipline of the Latins, in order to their reunion; while the Greeks, tho' in humiliating circumſtances, could not help diſcovering their contempt for the Latins, and their antipathy to them. Even during the conferences a Greek prieſt laid a perſon under eccleſiaſtical cenſure for attending maſs while it was celebrated by the Latins. All the indulgence the nuncios would allow the Greeks was that they ſhould not be obliged publicly to chaunt the creed with the addition of the clauſe *filioque*, tho' it was inſiſted that it ſhould be inſerted in it.

When the council was aſſembled, nothing paſſed in it but mutual accuſations, at which the emperor expreſſed much concern; ſaying that, if they had met in his preſence, the conference would have been conducted in a more amicable manner. Perceiving the impatience of the nuncios to return, he obſerved to them, that a ſchiſm which had continued now three hundred years could not be expected to be compoſed in a very ſhort time,

reckoning from the patriarchate of Photius. They, therefore, met once more at the palace, the 28th of April. There the Greeks maintained that the eucharist could not be rightly celebrated with any other than leavened bread, such as they said our Saviour himself used. This opinion, at the requisition of the nuncios, they expressed in writing; and on the other hand, at the requisition of the Greeks, the nuncios expressed in writing their opinion, that, without believing that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father, a person is in the way of perdition. The next day these writings were publicly delivered, and regularly signed. In that of the Greeks on the subject of the eucharist, their opinion only was expressed without the authorities on which it was founded; but that of the nuncios on the subject of the creed was a treatise of some length. Having delivered this, the nuncios declared that the writing of the Greeks contained a heresy, and haughtily demanded to know whether it was thro' malice, or ignorance. This led to a dispute about the meaning of the word ἄρτος, which the Greeks maintained must signify *bread completely made*, and of course with leaven; whereas the nuncios said it might signify bread without leaven; and that as, during the passover, the Jews were not allowed to have any leavened bread, our Saviour must have used

uſed that which was unleavened. Thus this whole day paſſed in mere wrangling.

Afterwards, the nuncios being in private conference with the emperor, he obſerved to them, that when princes had a difference, and wiſhed to make peace, they relaxed a little on both ſides, and therefore he propoſed that, as there were two principal points of difference between the two churches, viz. that concerning the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit, and that concerning the bread uſed in the euchariſt, the Greeks ſhould give up the latter, and the Latins the former. But the nuncios having no idea of this kind of policy in matters of religion, replied, that the church of Rome would not give up one *iota* of its faith; and therefore that, if the Greeks wiſhed for an union, they muſt firmly believe themſelves, and teach to others, that the body of our Saviour may be conſecrated with unleavened bread, as well as leavened, and muſt, moreover, condemn and burn thoſe of their books which contained a contrary doctrine. And that, with reſpect to the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit, they muſt believe and teach the people that it is from the Son, as well as from the Father, tho' they ſhould not be obliged to chaunt it in public; but the books containing the contrary doctrine muſt be burned. At this arrogance the emperor was much offend-

offended, and when he reported this converſation to the Greek prieſts, they were no leſs ſo.

There was, however, another meeting, in order to conclude the buſineſs in ſome proper form. But this was conducted with the ſame pertinacious diſputation, and ended with more ill humour than the preceding. The nuncios, after reciting the faith of the Greeks with reſpect to the euchariſt, ſaid, "This is hereſy, and finding you heretics, "and excommunicated, we leave you ſuch." Having made this declaration, they left the council, the Greeks ſhouting after them, "You are the "heretics." The emperor, however, was much mortified at this termination of the buſineſs.

The Greeks not being intirely ſatisfied with what they had delivered in writing, deſired that the writings on both ſides ſhould be given up; but the nuncios ſaid, they would leave theirs, wiſhing it to be made known to all the world as the faith of the Roman church, and that they would keep that of the Greeks, an an evidence of their hereſy; but ſaid, as we are in your power, you may do as you pleaſe. A public officer then ſignified to them, that they muſt give up the writings. They, therefore, took with them ſuch books as they could carry, and ſet out on their journey on foot. But the Greeks ſent after them, and ſearching their baggage, took away the writing they wiſhed

to

to withdraw, and in its place put another, containing a fuller explanation of their faith on the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit. It was evident from the whole conduct of this buſineſs, that there was no diſpoſition on the part of the Greeks to any union, and that the emperor only wiſhed it for political purpoſes.

Many years after this, when the Greeks had recovered the poſſeſſion of Conſtantinople, the emperor Michael Paleologus, being afraid of Charles king of Sicily, expreſſed a deſire of the reunion of the two churches, acknowledging the ſupremacy of the pope; and Gregory X. who had much at heart the recovery of the holy land, and hoped that this union would contribute to it, was very deſirous of promoting it. But the Greek patriarch and the clergy were not to be brought to accede to it; tho', knowing the ſituation and wiſhes of the emperor, they ſeemed to favour the project. The emperor, however, being determined to be obeyed, partly by intreaty, and partly by force, engaged almoſt all the biſhops to ſubſcribe a paper, in which they expreſſed their readineſs to acknowledge the ſupremacy of the biſhop of Rome, the right of appeals to him, and that his name ſhould be recited with thoſe of other orthodox biſhops at the euchariſt.

Having

Having gained this point, the emperor ſent ambaſſadors to the great council aſſembled at Lyons in A. D. 1274, where the pope himſelf was preſent, attended by five hundred biſhops, ſeventy abbots, and a thouſand other prelates, with James king of Arragon, and ambaſſadors from all the Chriſtian courts in Europe. On the arrival of the Greek ambaſſadors at Lyons, which was the 24th of June, they were introduced to the pope; and in preſenting the letters they brought, ſaid, they were come to render obedience to the church of Rome, and to acknowledge the faith which it held. In the public ſervice which they attended the liturgy was recited both in Latin and Greek, and in reciting the creed the addition of *filioque* was repeated three times. In the fourth ſeſſion, which was the 16th of July, the union of the two churches was ſolemnly announced by the pope, and the confeſſion of faith, which had been ſent by the Greek emperor (which was the ſame verbatim with that which had been ſent by pope Clement IV in A. D. 1267) was read, with this addition, that he would perſevere in that faith. He only requeſted that the Greeks might be permitted to recite the creed as they had been uſed to do it, and continue the ſame cuſtoms, which were not contrary to the deciſions of general councils, or the traditions of the Fathers, and which had been approved by the church of Rome

Rome. The letter of the Greek biſhops, which was alſo read, mentioned the obſtinacy of their patriarch in refuſing to acknowledge the ſupremacy of the church of Rome; but they added that, if he perſiſted in thoſe ſentiments, they would depoſe him, and chuſe another who would be more compliant. At the return of thoſe ambaſſadors, the patriarch Joſeph not conſenting to the union, he was depoſed, and retired to a monaſtery; but this cauſed a new ſchiſm in the Greek church, and the two parties conſidered each other as excommunicated.

In A. D. 1277 there arrived at Rome ambaſſadors from the Greek emperor, and the new patriarch Veccas, expreſſing their joy in the union of the two churches, acknowledging in the fulleſt manner the ſupremacy of the pope, and his right to decide in all articles of faith. The patriarch in his letter recited all the diſtinguiſhing articles of the Roman church, but on the article of the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit, he uſed many words, which was afterwards the occaſion of a diſpute among the Greeks on the ſubject. This patriarch alſo publiſhed an excommunication againſt thoſe Greeks who did not accede to the union. This violence, however, had no good effect. The more intelligent of the ſchiſmatics were quiet, but they reſolutely perſiſted in their oppoſition, and many of the lower people

people went to reſide in places not ſubject to the emperor.

After the Greek ambaſſadors had left Rome, the pope ſent four to Conſtantinople in A. D. 1278, and doubting the ſincerity of the Greek clergy, he exhorted the patriarch to procure from every biſhop a profeſſion of his faith, an acknowledgment of the ſupremacy of the church of Rome, and an abjuration of the ſchiſm. The ambaſſadors were alſo deſired to require of the emperor that he ſhould inſiſt upon the patriarch and other prelates ſending a confeſſion of their faith in the very ſame form with that which he himſelf had ſent, and that the creed ſhould be recited with the addition of *filioque*. Particular cuſtoms, to which the Greeks had been uſed were to be tolerated, provided they were not contrary to the faith, and the canons. The pope alſo deſired to have the confeſſions of the faith of the Greek prelates to be publicly regiſtered, and that they ſhould apply to Rome to get abſolved from the cenſures which they had incurred during the ſchiſm, and for a confirmation in their dignities; and alſo to have a cardinal legate to reſide at Conſtantinople. The ambaſſadors were at the ſame time charged to get an exact knowledge of the real diſpoſition of the Greeks, and a poſitive anſwer to all his demands.

But

But in the Eaſt things were by no means in ſo favourable a ſituation as the pope wiſhed. The Greeks in general, and even the emperor's own relations, were ſo much offended at his ſubmiſſion to the pope, that they revolted from him, calling him the pope's patriarch, and all who joined him heretics. Thus the two parties being at open variance excommunicated one another. The diſaffected party invited Alexis Comnenus, who had eſtabliſhed himſelf at Trebiſonde on the taking of Conſtantinople by the Latins, to aſſume the title of emperor, promiſing to join him, which they did.

In the mean time the emperor, in order to gain the Greek biſhops, aſſured them that he would not ſwerve an iota from their faith or their cuſtoms, and leaſt of all with reſpect to the creed, but that in his circumſtances it was neceſſary for him to temporize with the Latins.

In anſwer to the demand of the pope to ſend a great number of ſubſcriptions to the particular confeſſion of faith required of the Greek clergy, many were ſent; but they were all in the ſame handwriting, and ſtill the expreſſions concerning the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit were not clear, but ſuch as left the queſtion undecided.

Notwithſtanding all theſe precautions, the emperor was obliged to have recourſe to very cruel and harſh meaſures in order to enforce the union,

and theſe rendered him very unpopular. Beſides, it appearing to the court of Rome that he was not able to carry his point, and even that he himſelf was not ſincere in it, his next ambaſſador to pope Martin IV was very ill received, and at the ſolicitation of Charles king of Sicily he was himſelf excommunicated in A. D. 1281, as a promoter of the antient ſchiſm and hereſy of the Greeks. Michael did not long ſurvive theſe proceedings againſt him, dying in A. D. 1282, and his ſon Andronicus, who ſucceeded him, thought ſo ill of his conduct in promoting the union, that he did not allow him the rites of Chriſtian burial.

The members of the proper Greek church being now the maſters, they ſummoned a council to meet in A. D. 1283, and then they condemned and burned the writings of Veccas in favour of the union. He was baniſhed to Pruſa in Bythinia, and afterwards almoſt all the biſhops who had favoured the union were depoſed.

The year following the two parties in the Greek church, in the intereſt of the two patriarchs, agreed to draw up in writing their ſeveral pretenſions, and throw them into a fire at the ſame time; perſuaded that, if either of them ſhould not be burned, that party had the ſanction of heaven, but if both were burned, they promiſed to unite. This taking place, they did unite, but afterwards repenting of this agree-

agreement, the difference was resumed. The emperor was very desirous of promoting peace, and for that purpose he summoned a council in which Veccas was heard; but it produced nothing besides altercation about the terms in which the procession of the Holy Spirit should be expressed, and at the termination of it Veccas was remanded to his place of banishment.

Still the Greeks suffered much by factions among themselves, and several patriarchs of Constantinople were appointed and displaced. The chief cause of their contentions, the particulars of which would not now be at all interesting or instructive, was an attempt of the patriarch Gregory of Cyprus to explain what John of Damascus had advanced concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, in a work which, for the sake of peace, he afterwards retracted; but the difference had no very material consequence.

SECTION XI.

Of the State of Infidelity, and various Hereſies in this Period.

THIS being an age of much and ſubtle ſpeculation, at the ſame time that the abuſes of the church of Rome were glaring and enormous, we cannot wonder that the reaſon of many perſons ſhould revolt at them, and that many ſhould begin to ſuſpect that the whole ſyſtem of Chriſtianity had its origin in impoſture, and had no other object than the emolument of the clergy. The riſe of this infidelity, as far as we are able to trace it, was from the writings of Averroes, a Spaniard, a man of great genius, who wrote commentaries on Ariſtotle, and pretended to find authorities for his opinions in his writings.

As far as we can collect the outline of this ſyſtem from the various condemnations of it, the diſciples of Averroes held that the world was eternal, creation out of nothing being impoſſible, that intellect is one principle, diffuſed thro' all intelligent beings, and conſequently that all ſeparate conſciouſneſs ceaſes at death, which was a fundamental principle in the antient Greek philoſophy, derived from

from the Eaſt; and that all the motions of the intellectual principle are virtuous. Since all ſin ariſes from the affections of the inferior part of man, they ſeem to have made light of ſome actions that have been ſo denominated, eſpecially as it was their opinion that all the actions of men were neceſſary, being determined by, or connected with, the motion of the ſtars and other heavenly bodies. Conſidering the whole ſyſtem of things as a chain of cauſes and effects, which has ſubſiſted unchargeably from all eternity, they probably conſidered all deviations from it by miracles to be impoſſible, and the accounts of them incredible, unworthy of examination.

In A. D. 1270 the following opinions were condemned by Tempier biſhop of Paris, "The underſtanding is the ſame in all men. The will "of man acts by neceſſity. Every thing below is "governed by the celeſtial bodies. The world "is eternal. There was no firſt man. The ſoul "is formed of matter, and decays with the body. "God knows nothing but himſelf. The actions "of men are not conducted by divine providence. "God cannot give incorruptibility and immortality to that which is corruptible and mortal." *Fleury*, Vol. 18. p. 137. Many of theſe queſtions were diſcuſſed, and the opinions refuted by T. Aquinas.

Such were, or ſeem to have been, the prevailing opinions of thoſe who were generally called *philoſophers* in this period, and in the time of Petrarch, who met with many of them at Venice, and in other parts of Italy. At the ſame time theſe philoſophers made no ſcruple of declaring their belief of all the doctrines of the church of Rome, and conforming to its diſcipline; ſaying, when they were interrogated, that, tho' the principles above mentioned were true in philoſophy, they were falſe in theology; ſo that there were no martyrs to them. However, the tendency of this ſyſtem of philoſophy to overturn that of theology was ſo evident, that it could not paſs unnoticed by thoſe who were intereſted in its ſupport, and the firſt cenſures that we meet with of it were from the univerſity of Paris, which was the great ſchool of divinity in thoſe times.

In A. D. 1276 the univerſity of Paris made a decree, that nothing but grammar and logic ſhould be taught in private; and the reaſon given for it was, that many errors had been introduced among the ſtudents, derived from the writings of heathens, which they ſaid were true according to philoſophy, meaning that of Ariſtotle, but not according to the Catholic faith. In enumerating the opinions they condemned, they mention the following: "In God there is no trinity. God cannot engender

"his

" his like. God knows nothing but himſelf. He " cannot make any more ſouls. He cannot make " a man without a proper agent, that is, another " man. He cannot know future contingencies, or " particular things. He cannot produce any " thing from nothing, or any thing otherwiſe than " it is, becauſe there are not in him different wills. " The human intellect is eternal. When ſeparated " from the body, it cannot ſuffer by fire. Intel- " lect is one in all men. The ſoul is inſeparable " from the body, and dies with it. The will and " the intellect do not move of themſelves, but by " the influence of the ſtars. The will is determined " by deſirable good, as matter by an agent. The " world is eternal, becauſe there cannot be novel- " ty in the effect without novelty in the cauſe. To " ſuppoſe the world not to have been eternal is to " ſuppoſe a vacuum, ſince empty ſpace muſt di- " vide the things to be put into it," and it was a received axiom, that nature abhorred a vacuum. " The univerſe can never end, becauſe the firſt " agent muſt eternally make matter paſs from one " form to another. The celeſtial bodies are moved " by an internal principle, which is a ſoul. Divers " ſigns in the heavens indicate the different diſpo- " ſitions of men, and by theſe ſigns the intentions " of men, and the events of their lives, may be " known. Theological diſcourſes are founded on

" fables, and men are not wiſer for knowing them. " There is no occaſion to pray, or to be concerned " about confeſſion, or the rites of burial, except " for appearance. Simple fornication is no ſin. " The reſurrection is impoſſible. Our happineſs " is in this life." *Fleury*, Vol. 18. p. 230.

Religion was not, however, without advocates in this early period of infidelity. Bernard Moneta, who wrote againſt the Cathari and Waldenſes, alſo wrote with great ability againſt the unbelievers. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 13.

It was the ſtudy of the works of Ariſtotle to which theſe opinions were generally aſcribed. From the ſame ſource it was alſo thought that the doctrines of Amalric, or Amauri, a profeſſor of logic and theology at Paris about A.D. 1210, were derived. It is certain, ſays Moſheim (Vol. 3. p. 129.) that he taught that all things were the parts of one ſubſtance, or in other words, that the univerſe was God, and that not only the forms of all things, but alſo their matter, or ſubſtance, proceeded from the deity, and muſt return to the ſource from which they were derived. From theſe principles he deduced a ſyſtem of devotion, pretending to demonſtrate the poſſibility of incorporating or tranſlating the human nature into the divine, and rejected all kinds of external worſhip as inſignificant and uſeleſs. His diſciples, he ſays, were men of exem-

exemplary piety, diſtinguiſhed by the gravity and auſterity of their lives, and ſuffered death in the moſt dreadful forms with the utmoſt conſtancy.

The opinion of the origin of all things from God I have obſerved to have been a principle in the oriental philoſophy, and that of the union of ſouls to God by abſtract meditation was held by the later Platoniſts, and has been adopted with ſome modifications by many perſons of a ſpeculative and devotional term in all ages of Chriſtianity, and by ſome of the zealous members of the church of Rome, as we ſhall ſee hereafter. But theſe exalted ideas of devotion, which rendered external forms of leſs value, were naturally regarded with a jealous eye by the political and ruling Catholics.

According to Fleury, Amauri held that, in order to be ſaved, every perſon muſt believe that he is a member of Jeſus Chriſt, but that the pope condemning this opinion, he retracted it before his death. Fleury alſo aſcribes to the followers of Amauri an opinion which is ſaid to have taken its riſe from a book entitled *the Everlaſting Goſpel*, viz. that Jeſus Chriſt aboliſhed the old law, and that, in his time commenced the diſpenſation of the Holy Spirit, in which confeſſion, baptiſm, the euchariſt, and other ſacraments, would have no place; but that perſons might be ſaved by the interior grace of the Holy Spirit, without any exter-

nal acts. He moreover says, that he denied the resurrection, said that heaven and hell were in men's own breasts, that the pope was Antichrist, and Rome Babylon. His disciples had among them a prophet named *William*, a silver smith, who gave out that four great plagues would come in five years. Being examined in a council of bishops and doctors of theology, they were condemned, and burned alive, except four, who were sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. At the same time they condemned the memory of Amauri, who was considered as the founder of the sect; and being excommunicated after his death A. D. 1209, his bones were dug up, and thrown upon a dunghill.

Amauri, Mosheim says, entertained the sentiments of those who were called the *brethren and sisters of the free spirit*, and they were sometimes called *Beghards*. They frequently ran about with an air of lunacy and distraction, begging their bread with much clamour, rejecting labour, as inconsistent with that contemplation which they supposed united the soul to God; in consequence of which they said they enjoyed a state of freedom from all laws, and had the same union with God that Christ himself had. For they were said to hold that all rational souls are portions of the divinity. But among them there were many persons of eminent piety, often called *mystics*, who only thought

thought themſelves exempt from the forms of external worſhip, and the poſitive laws of the church; tho' others of them are ſaid to have abandoned all decency, and to have lived in ſenſual indulgence, as not affecting the purity of the ſoul. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 124. 129.

At the ſame time alſo, Ariſtotle's treatiſe of metaphyſicks being ſuppoſed to have led men into theſe errors, the council ordered all his works to be burned, and forbad the tranſcribing them, reading them, or keeping copies of them, under pain of excommunication. As to his books of natural philoſophy, the reading of them was forbidden for three years; but they forbad for ever the reading of the books of one David Dinant, an eminent diſciple of Amauri, who ſaved himſelf by flight. The council alſo condemned all French books of theology. This is ſaid in the notes to Moſheim to have been done at a council at Paris in A. D. 1210. Vol. 3. p. 23.

In this period much attention was excited to a book entitled, as I have obſerved, *the Everlaſting Goſpel*, aſcribed, but without reaſon, to Joachim of Calabria, who died in A. D. 1202, and was conſidered as a ſaint in his own country. He wrote commentaries on the prophetical books of ſcripture with conjectures about the ſpeedy accompliſhment of [illegible] of them. According to this treatiſe, who-

ever was the author of it, the Father operated from the creation to the coming of Chriſt, as he ſaid, *My Father worketh hitherto, and now I work*, but at the expiration of the thouſand two hundred and ſixty years, mentioned in the Revelation, the Holy Spirit is to operate, who was to come, and *lead men into all truth*. They alſo ſaid, that the firſt diſpenſation was to conſiſt of married perſons, living according to the fleſh as under the old teſtament, that the reign of the Son was to be that of prieſts, living according to the fleſh and ſpirit, ſome being married; but that the third diſpenſation would be that of monks, living according to the ſpirit only. The firſt was the age of the old teſtament, the ſecond that of the new, and the third that of the Everlaſting Goſpel, in which there was no occaſion for ſacraments, or viſible ſigns. Theſe principles having ſpread very much, chiefly by means of the Franciſcans, who flattered themſelves that their inſtitute was the third, and moſt perfect ſtate of Chriſtianity; they were condemned in a council held at Arles in A. D. 1260.

There was another book entitled *An Introduction to the Everlaſting Goſpel*, aſcribed with great probability to John of Parma, a general of the Franciſcans, who explained the obſcure predictions of the former work, and applied them to his own order. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 67. The principles of theſe

theſe books began to be publicly taught in A. D. 1254; but in A. D. 1256 pope Alexander IV, tho' a great favourer of the Franciſcans, could not help condemning them, and the books were burned though privately, at the ſame time that he made ſome decrees in favour of that order.

Thoſe who diſtinguiſhed themſelves the moſt by the acuteneſs of their ſpeculations, and nice diſtinctions, were the mendicants. The clergy, who never liked them, and who wiſhed to have all ſtudy confined to the ſcriptures, the antient Fathers, and the canons, took umbrage at the liberty they took in ſpeculation, and thought the opinions they adopted ſometimes bordered on hereſy. To give ſome idea of the queſtions they agitated, and the opinions then formed, I ſhall ſelect the following, which were condemned in an aſſembly of the clergy at Paris in A. D. 1243. "The divine eſſence can-
"not itſelf be viewed either by glorified men or by
"angels. Tho' the divine eſſence is the ſame in
"the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, nevertheleſs
"with reſpect to *form*, it is not the ſame in the
"Holy Spirit as in the Father and the Son taken
"together. The Holy Spirit, as he is love, or a
"bond of union, doth not proceed from the Son,
"but from the Father only. Neither bodies nor
"ſouls in a ſtate of glory, not even the bleſſed vir-
"gin, will be in the empyreal heaven along with
"the

" the angels, but in the aqueous or cryſtalline " heaven, above the firmament. The wicked an- " gels were ſo from the inſtant of their creation. " There are ſeveral truths which have been from " eternity, and yet are not God. An angel may " be at the ſame moment in different places, and " even every where, if he chuſe it. The firſt in- " ſtant of time, the beginning, and alſo creation " and paſſion, are neither creature nor creator. " The wicked angel has never had wherewith to " ſupport himſelf, any more than Adam, in a ſtate " of innocence. He who has the beſt natural diſpo- " ſitions will neceſſarily have moſt grace and glo- " ry." *Fleury*, Vol. 17. p. 265.

In A. D. 1278 ſome opinions of Roger Bacon, an Engliſh Franciſcan (but what they were are not ſpecified) were condemned by the legate of pope Nicolas III at Paris, and he was committed to priſon, where he lived ten years; but obtaining his liberty, he ſpent the remainder of his life in peace, in the college of his order at Oxford, and died in A. D. 1294. He was indefatigable in his purſuit of knowledge, and ſeems to have been maſter of all that was known in his time, eſpecially in mathematics and philoſophy. It is probable that he either diſcovered, or had learned, the compoſition of gunpowder, and was acquainted with many wonderful diſcoveries in optics, mathematics, and chemiſtry.

Peter

Peter Lombard, having ſaid that there was a diſtinction between the *divine eſſence*, and the three perſons in the Godhead, the abbot Joachim denied that there was any eſſence common to them; by which it was ſaid that that which conſtitutes their union was taken away. On this account his opinions were condemned by Innocent III in the council of Lateran in A. D. 1205, but without any reflection upon Joachim himſelf. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 134.

At a council held in London in A. D. 1286, the following opinion among others of a ſimilar nature was condemned. "The ſacramental bread "is changed into the living body of Jeſus Chriſt, "ſo that the matter of the bread is changed into "the matter of the body, and the form of the bread "is the form of the body, which is the reaſonable "ſoul." It is poſſible, however, that theſe, and other opinions, might have paſſed without cenſure, if the eſpouſers of them had not maintained that, "with reſpect to them, they were not obliged to "yield to the authority of the pope, of St. Grego-"ry, or St. Auſtin, or any doctor whatever, but "only the authority of the Bible, and demonſtrative "reaſon." However Fleury ſays the principle on which all the opinions hinged was that the reaſonable ſoul is the ſubſtantial form of man, a principle, he ſays, advanced by Thomas Aquinas.

I would

I would obſerve in this place, that the term *tranſubſtantiation* is firſt uſed in any inſtrument of authority in the canons of the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215.

The laſt of the curious opinions that I ſhall recite as occurring within this period, is that, at the ſame council it was mentioned as a thing allowed by all, that the virgin Mary was taken up into heaven in the body; ſince Gilbert of Nogent ſays that, in his time, which was a century before, the church did not aſſert it, but that perſons were allowed to be of that opinion. *Fleury*, Vol. 16. p. 256.

SECTION XII.

Some Particulars concerning the Superſtition, and fabulous Hiſtories of this Period.

IF I had thought proper, I might have given my readers abundant entertainment on the ſubject of this ſection in every period of this hiſtory; but I confine myſelf to ſuch narratives as ſerve to give what ought not to be omitted, viz. a juſt idea of the ſtate of prevailing opinions and practices, which cannot fail to be inſtructive. We may often perceive the beſt diſpoſitions and intentions in the moſt

moſt wild and abſurd practices; but to form a juſt eſtimate of them we muſt take into conſideration the prevailing principles and maxims of the times. The firſt account I ſhall give will be that of the *Flagellants*.

In A. D. 1259, Italy being in a ſtate of great diſtraction, a ſpirit of devotion ſeized a great number of perſons in a very ſudden and extraordinary manner, but probably aroſe from the preaching of the mendicants, who, in imitation of John the Baptiſt, and Jeſus Chriſt, called upon all men *to repent*. It began at Peruſia, whence it paſſed to Rome, and the reſt of Italy. Old and young, even children of five years of age, went thro' the country, as naked as decency would permit, two and two, whipping themſelves with leathern thongs, till the blood flowed out, with groans and tears imploring the mercy of God, and the aſſiſtance of the bleſſed virgin. They made theſe proceſſions even in the night, with lighted torches, and alſo in the winter, by hundreds and thouſands, preceded by prieſts with croſſes and banners. Wherever they came they went into the churches, and proſtrated themſelves before the altars. They did the ſame both in the villages and the towns, ſo that the mountains and plains ecchoed with their cries. Their devotion did not, however, terminate here. Enemies were reconciled, uſurers and thieves

reſtored what they had unjuſtly taken, other ſinners confeſſed their crimes and reformed, and good works of all kinds were performed; and in this we ſee the difference between Chriſtian and heathen ſuperſtition, the latter having no connection whatever with moral virtue.

This practice, it was obſerved, did not ariſe from any order of a pope, or the recommendation of any perſon of particular eminence, but began with the common people, and others followed their example. It extended to Germany, Poland, and many other countries. Their cuſtom was to whip themſelves every day for thirty-three days together, becauſe Chriſt, they thought, lived ſo many years upon earth; and they ſung hymns concerning his death and paſſion. No perſon, they ſaid, could be abſolved from their ſins if they did not perform this penance, at leaſt one month, and they confeſſed to one another, and gave formal abſolution, tho' they were laymen. They even pretended that this practice was uſeful to the dead. This company of Flagellants, as they were called, at length gave alarm to ſeveral princes, ſo that they were ſuppreſſed by force; and in a ſhort time the practice ceaſed. But we ſhall find it renewed in a later period.

Perhaps the perſon the moſt diſtinguiſhed for his habitual devotion in this period was Lewis IX king

king of France, if we may depend upon the account of his confeſſor and chaplain, both Dominicans. Every day he heard the canonical maſs, even the *hours of the virgin*, with the *chaunt*. If he was travelling on horſeback, he contented himſelf with reciting it along with his chaplain. Every day, alſo, he recited the office of the dead at nine leſſons, even on the moſt ſolemn feſtivals. He never failed to hear two maſſes every day, and ſometimes three or four. He was fond of hearing ſermons, and when they pleaſed him, he retained them in memory, and repeated them to others. Having heard that ſome of his lords complained of his hearing ſo many maſſes and ſermons, he ſaid, "If "I had ſpent twice as much time in playing at "dice, or hunting, no body would have ſpoken "of it."

It was his cuſtom for ſome time to riſe at midnight, to aſſiſt at the matims which were chaunted in his chapel, and at his return to have leiſure to pray by his bed ſide, ſaying, "if God ſhould then "give me any pious motion I am not afraid of "being interrupted." But this exerciſe weakening him too much, he was perſuaded to omit it. After ſupper *complines* were ſolemnly chaunted in his chapel, and when he retired to his chamber, a prieſt came and ſprinkled the room, and eſpecially the bed, with holy water. With the conſent of

the queen, he abſtained from any matrimonal intercourſe, according to the antient cuſtom of the church, during the whole of advent and lent, alſo on certain days in the week, on the vigils and grand feſtivals; and when he was to receive the communion he abſtained ſeveral days before and after the ſervice. His abſtinence with reſpect to food was very great. He faſted every friday, he ate no fleſh meat on wedneſdays, and for ſome time on mondays alſo, till on account of his weakneſs he was adviſed to omit it. On fridays in lent and advent he ate neither fruit nor fiſh. On holy friday he faſted on bread and water, and alſo on the vigils and principal feſtivals of the virgin, and ſome other days in the year. He confeſſed every friday, and after confeſſion he always received the diſcipline at the hand of his confeſſor with five iron chains faſtened to the bottom of a little ivory box, which he carried in his purſe, and he ſometimes made preſents of ſuch boxes to his children and particular friends. He wore haircloth on fridays in lent, advent, and at the vigils of the virgin, but by the advice of his confeſſor he left this off.

On good friday, after aſſiſting at matins, which began at midnight, he returned to his chamber, where, either alone, or accompanied by a chaplain, he repeated the whole pſalter. Then, without going

going to bed, or ſleeping any more, he went out at ſunriſe, barefooted, and meanly dreſſed, walked thro' the moſt frequented ſtreets, on the pavement and in the dirt. He went into the churches, and prayed in them, followed by an almoner, who gave liberally to the poor. After his return, tho' generally much fatigued, he heard the ſermon of the paſſion, then he aſſiſted at the office, which was celebrated in a ſolemn manner; and when he came to the adoration of the croſs, he roſe from his place, bareheaded, and barefooted, and meanly dreſſed, and went a good diſtance on his knees, followed by his children, with ſuch marks of humility, that thoſe who were preſent ſhed tears. The ſervice being over, he took a ſlight repaſt of bread and water.

On holy thurſday he waſhed the feet of ſome poor people, and thoſe of three poor old men every ſaturday. After this I need not mention his alms, and benefactions of every kind, eſpecially his liberality to the mendicants. When the expence attending theſe things was complained of, he ſaid, "Since I muſt be at ſome expence, I had "rather do it for God, than for the world, and va-"nity, and thus balance the exceſſive expences "that are unavoidable in temporal things." Can we doubt the real piety and virtue of this man, even tho' he was a perſecutor of heretics, and would

without remorſe have ſhed the blood of all the infidels in the Eaſt. He would, however, have received more pleaſure from their converſion. When this prince was dangerouſly ill in A. D. 1244, they brought out the relicks of the martyrs belonging to the church of St. Denis, placed them on altar, carried them in proceſſion thro' the church, and the cloiſters, walking barefoot, and ſhedding many tears; and from that time it was obſerved that he began to recover. *Fleury*, Vol. 17. p. 289.

The hiſtory of the conveyance of what was ſuppoſed to be the *crown of thorns*, that was put on the head of Jeſus, from Conſtantinople to France, in A. D. 1247, will ſerve to give an idea of the ſpirit of the times, as well as of the religion of this particular prince. The probability is that the crown that was really put on the head of our Saviour was not of thorns, but of the herb *acanthus*, the intention of the ſoldiers, in this as well as in putting on him the purple robe, having been to mock, and not to torture him; and none of the antients ſpeak of this as painful to him. In after times, however, it was ſuppoſed that this crown was of real thorns, and being thought to have been actually found, as well as the croſs, and every thing elſe belonging to the crucifixion, it was kept at Conſtantinople; and when that city was taken by the Latins, it was conſidered as one of the moſt

valuable

valuable articles found in the place. This crown, the lords, being much in debt, had pawned to the Venetians for a large ſum; but the emperor Baldwin, willing to lay on obligation on Lewis, to whom he had pawned the county of Namur, propoſed to make a preſent of it to the king. Accordingly two Dominicans were ſent to receive the ſacred depoſit, and the box in which it was contained was delivered to them, carefully ſealed; and tho' thoſe who had the care of it put to ſea in the moſt dangerous ſeaſon, and the Greek emperor lay in wait to intercept them, they arrived without any accident at Venice. The king and the emperor Baldwin then ſent ambaſſadors to Venice, with money to redeem the ſacred pledge, and other precautions were taken for the ſafe conveyance of it; and it was obſerved that during their journey, tho' they had heavy rains in the night, not one drop fell upon them, while they were on the road. When they were arrived at Troyes in Champaigne, they ſent to inform the king, who immediately ſet out, accompanied with the queen mother, his brothers, the archbiſhop of Sens, the biſhop of Auxerre, and ſome other lords, and met the relick at Villeneuve.

Having opened the outer box of wood, and verified the ſeals of the French lords and the doge of Venice, which were fixed to a caſe of ſilver,

they opened that, and in it found another of gold, which contained the ſacred crown. This being ſhewn to the king and his ſuite, they ſhed many tears, imagining they ſaw Chriſt himſelf crowned with thorns. This was St. Lawrence's day. The next day, Auguſt 8, it was carried to Sens, and at the gates of the city the king, and Robert count of Artois, the eldeſt of his brothers, took it on their ſhoulders, both of them being barefooted, and in their ſhirts, and carried it to the metropolitan church of St. Stephen, in the midſt of all the clergy of the city, who came in ſolemn proceſſion to meet them.

The next day the king ſet out for Paris, and the eighth day after he arrived there, and near the abbey of St. Anthony a ſcaffold was prepared on which were many prelates in their robes, and from this the box was ſhewn to the people. Then the king and the count of Artois, barefooted, and in their ſhirts, carried it on their ſhoulders to the cathedral church of Notre Dame, and thence to the palace, when it was placed in the royal chapel.

But ſome years after this, the king having received from Conſtantinople a conſiderable part of the true croſs, and ſeveral other relicks, built another chapel of the richeſt and moſt elegant architecture then known, and there founded a chapter to recite the office before theſe holy relicks.

The

The church of Paris celebrates the feſtival of the reception of this holy crown on the 11th of Auguſt, and the hiſtory of it was then written by Gautier archbiſhop of Sens. *Fleury*, Vol. 17. p. 200.

The hiſtory of the reception of ſome of the *blood of Chriſt* by king Henry III of England is as curious as the preceding. This prince wrote to all his lords to meet him in London the 13th of October A. D. 1247, to hear "the pleaſing news "of a new favour that God had granted them." Accordingly they met at Weſtminſter on the day appointed, when they were informed that the maſters of the Templars and Hoſpitallers had ſent them a portion of the blood of our Saviour, in a very antient cryſtal vaſe, with the atteſtation of the patriarch of Jeruſalem, and that of the biſhops, abbots and lords of the holy land. On this occaſion the king, deſirous of imitating what St. Lewis had done to honour the true croſs, faſted on bread and water the eve of the feſtival, which was that of the tranſlation of St. Edward; and on that day he carried the relick in ſolemn proceſſion from the cathedral church of St. Paul to that of St. Peter at Weſtminſter, where it was depoſited. The biſhop of Norwich then performed maſs, and delivered a ſermon, in which he ſaid that this relick was more precious than any other, even that of the true croſs, which was only valuable on account of this blood

that was ſhed upon it. He then declared, in the name of all the prelates, that ſix years and one hundred and forty days indulgence would be granted to thoſe who would honour the precious blood.

Some, however, who were preſent expreſſed their doubt of the reality of the relick. To this the biſhop of Lincoln, Robert Groſthead, anſwered in a diſcourſe, in which he ſaid, tho' on the authority of a book which he owned to be apocryphal, that Joſeph of Arimathia, when he looſed the body of Chriſt from the croſs, carefully gattered up the blood from his wounds, and eſpecially that from his ſide, and even the water with which he waſhed the body; that he gave part of it to Nicodemus, who had aſſiſted him in conveying the body to the ſepulchre, and that thus this treaſure had been preſerved from father to ſon till it came into the poſſeſſion of the patriarch Robert, who then held the ſee of Jeruſalem.

To this fabulous relation I ſhall add another, compoſed in this period, by Bonaventure, from apocryphal writings, as Fleury ſays, which then paſſed for true, or revelations not much to be depended on, of the delivery of the virgin Mary, which is as follows. When her hour was come, which was ſunday at midnight, the virgin got up, and leaned againſt a pillar, while Joſeph was ſitting, concerned that he could not provide what

was

was required in her circumſtances. However he roſe, and taking ſome hay from the manger, laid it at her feet; and then as he was looking another way, the Son of God came out of the womb of the virgin, without giving her any pain, and lay on the hay that was at her feet. She then took him up, embraced him tenderly, placed him on her knees, and waſhed him with her milk which flowed from her in great abundance, then wrapped him in a vail, which ſhe took from her head, and placed him in the manger. After this an ox and an aſs, falling on their knees, put their mouths to the manger, and breathed on the child, to warm him, as if they had known who he was. The mother then fell on her knees, and adored him, giving thanks to God, and Joſeph did the ſame. Bonaventure ſaid he had theſe particulars from a friar of his order, to whom the virgin herſelf had revealed them. *Fleury*, Vol. 18. p. 122.

I ſhall cloſe this ſection with an account of an inſtance of ſuperſtition in the Greeks. On February A. D. 1284 a Greek prieſt found the conſecrated bread which had by accident been left in the place where it was kept from the laſt year, then quite corrupted, and not having the appearance of bread. On ſeeing this he was terrified, and trembled; and conſulting with thoſe who were preſent, they agreed to throw it into what they called

called the *facred furnace*, and which Fleury ſays the Latins call *piſcina*. Vol. 18. p. 366.

SECTION XIII.

Of the Jews in this Period.

IN this, as in the preceding period, the Jews were expoſed to much and various ill uſage. At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, they were required to wear a badge, to diſtinguiſh them from Chriſtians. In A. D. 1234 the kingdom of Hungary was laid under an interdict for admitting Jews as well as Mahometans into public employments, and having Chriſtian ſlaves; and it was not taken off till the king and his ſon engaged to allow of that abuſe no longer; but, ſays the hiſtorian, it was ill obſerved.

In A. D. 1236 there was a great carnage made of the Jews in many places, eſpecially in Spain. In France the cruſaders againſt the Albigenſes killed them in great numbers, without ſparing children or women with child; many were trampled to death by horſes, and their bodies expoſed to the beaſts. Their books were burned, their goods plundered, and great miſchiefs were threatened becauſe

becauſe they refuſed to be baptized. On this occaſion the Jews applied to the pope, who wrote in their favour; ſaying that, no perſon ſhould be compelled to receive baptiſm; that as man fell by his free will, he ought to recover by the ſame means, with the aſſiſtance of grace. He alſo wrote to the king, deſiring that he would reſtrain thoſe cruelties.

John king of England harraſſed the Jews with the moſt grievous exactions, applying corporal puniſhment when they refuſed to give him money. It is ſaid that he demanded of a Jew of Briſtol a thouſand marks of ſilver, and on his refuſal to pay he ordered a tooth to be drawn every day till he ſhould pay, and this, it is ſaid, he bore till he had loſt ſeven of them. The hiſtorian Trivet ſays that he confiſcated the property of all the Jews in his kingdom, and baniſhed them by a public edict. *Baſnage*, Vol. 9. p. 619.

The cruſades furniſhed Henry III of England with a pretence for taking from the Jews what remained of their property from former exactions. Having demanded eight thouſand marks, they repreſented to him that, being unable to raiſe that ſum, they wiſhed to leave the kingdom. This provoked him ſo much that he ſold them to his brother Richard, who advanced a large ſum on that account. But when it was expected that he would

would have reimburſed himſelf by exacting twice as much, he was ſo moved by the repreſentation of their poverty and diſtreſs, that he forbore to do it.

In A. D. 1239 the Jews of Norwich being accuſed of intending to murder a Chriſtian child, they were all apprehended, and four of them were torn in pieces by horſes, and their limbs expoſed on a gibbet. *Baſnage*, Vol. 9. p. 621.

The Jews of Lincoln being accuſed of the ſame crime, eighteen of the richeſt of them were put to death, at the ſolicitation of the mother. *Ib.* Vol. 9. p. 634. At length, however, giving the king a ſum of money they obtained a proclamation forbidding to uſe them ill. *Fleury*, Vol. 17. p. 129.

After the death of the king, the nation being viſited with the plague, it was ſaid to be owing to the indulgence ſhewn to the Jews; and after pretending to give them liberty to chuſe which religion they preferred, all that did not adopt the Chriſtian were put to death. Tho' there is ſomething that has the air of fable in the circumſtances of this ſtory, as related by the monkiſh hiſtorians, it is certain that the Jews were baniſhed the kingdom by Edward III, who allowed them to go to France, but confiſcated their property. Their number in England was then very great, and they did not obtain leave to return till the time of Cromwell.

In

In A. D. 1238, a converted Jew informing the pope concerning the Talmud, as the principal cauſe of keeping his brethren true to their religion, orders were given that in all Chriſtian countries the Jews ſhould deliver up their books, and that thoſe of them that contained any errors ſhould be burned. In conſequence of this, and the examination of ſome of them, twenty cart loads were burned in France, in the preſence of the univerſity, the clergy, and the people of Paris. Many Chriſtians at this time were able to read Hebrew. Beſides thoſe in France, mention is made by Matthew Paris of Robert Arundel, probably an Engliſhman, as well ſkilled in that language.

In A. D. 1247, pope Innocent IV wrote to the biſhops of Germany in favour of the Jews, who were cruelly treated, and ſometimes put to death, on pretence that they had killed the children of Chriſtians, eaten their hearts, and been guilty of other crimes, of which they were innocent, deſiring that their wrongs might be redreſſed, and that they ſhould not be condemned without reaſon.

In A. D. 1248, John duke of Tuſcany, at the requeſt of the biſhops and lords, drove all the Jews from his territories.

At the council of Vienne in A. D. 1267, the Jews were required to wear a cap of horn, to pay tythes

tythes to the curé, and all other duties that were exacted of the Christians who lodged with them.

In A. D. 1291 it was said that a Jew at Paris, getting possession of a consecrated wafer, pricked it with a penknife; that on this blood came out of it, and that, tho' he abused it in various ways, it always shewed marks of sensibility; that at length it took its place on a crucifix, in the form of Christ upon the cross. The consequence of this ridiculous notion was very serious. For the Jew was apprehended, and burned, and the people called the house in which this scene was supposed to have been transacted, the *house of miracles*, and a chapel was afterwards built on the spot.

Notwithstanding the great odium under which the Jews generally lay, there is abundant evidence, that in some of the southern parts of France, the common people were prejudiced in their favour, and leaned to their rites. In Provence, and the neighbouring places, the intercourse with the Jews had introduced many superstitious practices. Many persons in their illnesses held lamps and lighted candles in the synagogues, and made offerings there, to procure good journeys, and safe deliveries for women with child; and they shewed the same respect that the Jews did to the book of the law, which Christians in general considered as a kind of idolatry. The pope, to put a stop to these abuses, wrote

wrote to the Franciſcans, who exerciſed the office of inquiſitors in that part of the country, to proceed againſt thoſe who were guilty of thoſe things, as againſt idolatry and hereſy. This letter is dated February 20th, A. D. 1290.

SECTION XIV.

Miſcellaneous Articles,

LITTLE was done in this period towards extending the bounds of Chriſtendom, and that little not very ſolid. In A. D. 1255 a great army of German cruſaders, about ſixty thouſand, attacked that part of Pruſſia which continued Pagan, and killing all who refuſed to be baptized, reduced the whole to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. In the ſame year, Mondag, whom the pope on his profeſſion of Chriſtianity had made king of Lithuania, turned his arms againſt the Chriſtians, ſo that there was nothing, as the hiſtorian ſays, in his converſion, and his ſucceſſors continued heathen one hundred and thirty years after.

This was an age in which much attention was given to *literature*, and which produced many eminent men. At the council of Lateran in A. D.

1215, an order given in a council of A. D. 1179 under Alexander III, mentioned in the preceding ſection, that in every cathedral church there ſhould be a maſter, who ſhould teach gratis, but which had not been obſerved, was confirmed. He was to teach not only grammar, but any branch of ſcience that he was capable of teaching, and in every metropolitan church, there was to be a theologian to teach the prieſts the holy ſcriptures, and what related to the care of ſouls, each of theſe maſters was to have the ſalary of a prebend, as long as he taught, but without becoming a canon.

Frederic II was well verſed in the Latin, Greek, and Arabic languages, beſides Italian and French, his native tongue being the German. He compoſed poems in Italian. He was a great promoter of literature in his dominions, eſpecially by the eſtabliſhment of an univerſity at Naples, and procuring many books to be tranſlated from Arabic into Latin. *Giannone*, Vol. 1. p. 729. Alſo Alphonſus king of Caſtile and Leon diſtinguiſhed himſelf both by his own attainments in literature, and his zeal in promoting it. He is particularly famous for his aſtronomical tables. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 17.

Lewis IX hearing, when he was in Paleſtine, of a Mahometan prince getting all uſeful books tranſcribed for the uſe of learned men, did the ſame

on

on his return to France, especially all books relating to religion, and from them Vincent de Beauvais composed his *Grand Mirror*, which was a collection of every thing that he thought useful to a student.

This was the period in which the Aristotelian philosophy was most triumphant, being taught in all the schools till its tendency to favour infidelity was perceived. It was particularly adopted by the Dominican and Franciscan friars, among whom the most distinguished teachers were Alexander Hales, a Franciscan and an Englishman, who taught at Paris, and obtained the title of the *irrefragable doctor*, Albert surnamed *the Great*, a Dominican and a German, bishop of Ratisbon, the dictator, as it were, of all literature in his time; but especially his disciple Thomas Aquinas, a Dominican likewise, and surnamed the *Angelic doctor*. In the pontificate of Clement IV, he composed his *Sum of theology*, which was considered in the schools as the most complete system for doctrine and method. It is indeed a wonderfully elaborate work.

The college for the study of divinity in Paris was erected and endowed in A. D. 1250 by Robert de Sorbonne, a friend and favourite of king Lewis, and it retained his name ever after. *Mosheim*, Vol. 3. p. 19. In all the universities in this

period it was neceſſery to go thro' a ſtrict examination before any perſon could be intitled to teach the ſciences, and then aroſe the cuſtom of giving academical degrees, as that of *maſter* and *doctor*, in all the *faculties*, as they were called; an inſtitution which had its uſe in theſe times, while it might be fairly conſidered as a mark of real merit, but it is now no longer ſo, and therefore ought to be diſcontinued.

But the whole ſyſtem of Ariſtotelian philoſophy, as taught in theſe ſchools, was ſeverely cenſured by Roger Bacon, Peter de Abana, a phyſician of Padua, and other ſenſible men. The former, in one of his writings, ſays, "There never "was ſuch an appearance of learning, or ſo much "time given to ſtudy, as in theſe laſt forty years. "There are doctors in every city, camp, and village, eſpecially of the two orders of mendicants, "but never was there ſo much ignorance and error. The generality of ſtudents ſpend their time, "and their money, on bad tranſlations" (meaning from the Arabic) "They are deceived by appear-"ances, not caring what they know, but only "what they may ſeem to know, in the opinion of "the ſtupid multitude." *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 26.

Several things occurred in this period relating to the diſcipline of the church, which deſerve to be noticed.

At

At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, it was ordered, that every perſon ſhould confeſs all his ſins at leaſt once a year, to his proper prieſt, diſcharge the penance enjoined him, and receive the euchariſt at Eaſter, or be excommunicated, and deprived of Chriſtian burial. Raimond de Pegnafert, general of the Dominicans, who died in A. D. 1274, publiſhed a ſum of caſes of conſcience, for the uſe of confeſſors, which was the firſt work of this nature.

It appears from the decrees of the ſynod of Exeter in A. D. 1287, that after baptiſm children were confirmed, at leaſt within three years. But it appears from the decrees of the council of Arles in A. D. 1260, that confirmation was given to children at the breaſt, as Fleury ſays they ſtill did in many churches.

A ſuperſtitious reſpect for the elements of the euchariſt appears in this period to have begun to take the cup from the laity. We find in the writings of Alexander Hales, who died in A. D. 1244, that in his time the laity commonly communicated with the bread only. At a council held at Lambeth in A. D. 1281, it is ſaid that, in giving the communion, they informed the communicants, that what they received in the cup was only ſimple wine, to enable them to ſwallow with more eaſy the precious body; and in the inferior churches it

was permitted only to thoſe who celebrated to take the precious blood; but in cathedral churches the communion was ſtill adminiſtered in both kinds. At a council of Bourdeaux in A. D. 1255, it was ordered that infants, inſtead of the conſecrated wafer, ſhould only have *pain beni* given them, a remains, ſays Fleury, of the antient cuſtom of giving the euchariſt to children, which is ſtill kept up in the Greek church.

The cup was not wholly laid aſide till the council of Conſtance. *Bingham*, p. 789.

The uſe of wafers and unleavened bread were not known in the church till the eleventh or twelfth century, when the oblation of common bread began to be left off by the people. Then the clergy provided the elements themſelves, and gradually brought it to a nice and delicate wafer, in the form of a *denarius*, to repreſent, they ſaid, the pieces of money for which our Saviour was betrayed; and the people were ordered to offer a denarius, to be given to the poor, or to be applied to ſome ſacred uſe. *Ib.* p. 737. &c.

The mendicants introduced the cuſtom of keeping the conſecrated elements for private perſons to communicate out of the time of public ſervice in the church. This is acknowledged to be a novelty, and againſt the rule of the Roman ritual, which

which orders the elements to be kept in the church only for the ſick. *Bingham*, p. 782.

It was not till the twelfth century that the cuſtom of communicating infants was diſcontinued in France. *Ib.* p. 776.

The *miſſa ſicca* was the communion without the conſecration of the elements. St. Lewis had this ſervice performed in this manner on board his ſhips. It was ſometimes called *miſſa nautica*, and was approved by Leo X. *Ib.* p. 772. &c.

Miſſa bifaciata, or *trifaciata*, &c. was when a prieſt, for the ſake of getting the price of more maſſes than one in a day, recited the ſervice ſeveral times, till he came to the words of conſecration; which by uſing only once he made to ſerve for them all. *Ib.* p. 773.

In A. D. 1264 pope Urban inſtituted the feſtival of the *holy ſacrament*, from a viſion of one Juliana, a nun in the neighbourhood of Liege, where Urban had been archdeacon. It was to be celebrated the firſt thurſday after the octave of Whitſuntide. This Juliana declared that whenever ſhe prayed ſhe had before her an image of the full moon with a fiſſure in it, and was informed by the Holy Spirit, that this fiſſure ſignified the want of this annual feſtival in the church which was repreſented by the moon. The office was compoſed by Thomas Aquinas.

Till the twelfth century the faſt of lent was kept by abſtaining from all food till evening. *Bingham*, Vol. 2. p. 347.

In this period we find the origin of *indulgences*. They began with the biſhops, and were afterwards adopted by the popes. When the biſhops wanted money they remitted the uſual penances for certain ſums to be applied to religious uſes. This power of the biſhops was reſtricted by the popes, and in time they appropriated it to themſelves; and going far beyond what the biſhops had ever done, pretended to releaſe men from the penalties due to ſin even in a future ſtate. The great pretence for the papal indulgences was to promote the cruſades, but it was afterwards extended to every purpoſe that the popes thought ſubſervient to their views. *Moſheim*, Vol. 2. p. 420.

At the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215, ſuperfluous indulgences granted by ſome biſhops were forbidden, and it was ordered that, in the dedication of churches, the indulgence ſhould not be for more than a year, whether the ceremony was performed by one biſhop or more; and that for the anniverſary of a dedication, or any other cauſe, the indulgence ſhould not be for more than forty days.

By this time great abuſes had been made of indulgences. They who preached the cruſade in Ger-

Germany in A. D. 1225 advanced ſuch things, ſays the hiſtorian, or encouraged perſons in their crimes. For ſome of them ſaid, "I will commit "crimes; for on taking the croſs I ſhall be inno- "cent, and even make ſatisfaction for the crimes "of others;" and ſome perſons who had died impenitent, and had been buried in the high ways, were by this means taken up, and buried like Chriſtians.

During the twelfth or the thirteenth century religious plays were introduced into churches, and theſe prepared the way for ſacred oratorios. The firſt was a ſpiritual comedy in the church of Padua in A. D. 1243. About twenty years after was inſtituted at Rome the *fraternity of Gonfalone*, whoſe principal buſineſs was to repreſent the ſufferings of Jeſus in the paſſion week. The ſame ſubject was acted at Friuli in A. D. 1298, and near the Arno in A. D. 1304, when the people were entertained with the exhibition of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, a machine repreſenting hell being fixed on boats for the purpoſe. *Williams*, p. 42. In A. D. 1322 the myſteries began to be exhibited in Germany. In A. D. 1378 is the firſt mention made of their exhibition in England. While theſe myſteries were in faſhion, ſcarce any ſcripture hiſtory eſcaped being burleſqued in them. None of them were wholly without muſic. Hymns and

chorus's were introduced into all of them, and ſometimes inſtrumental muſic was introduced between the acts. *Williams*, p. 43.

About A. D. 1290 Marinus Sanutus brought wind inſtruments into the church. *Bingham*, p. 314.

PERIOD XX.

FROM THE TERMINATION OF THE CRUSADES A. D. 1291 TO THE CONCLUSION OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE A. D. 1418.

SECTION I.

Of the Power of the Popes, and the Oppoſition that was made to it.

THE claims of the popes to power, temporal and ſpiritual, were much oppoſed in the courſe of this period of our hiſtory; but they abated nothing of their arrogance, and on the whole, perhaps rather gained than loſt ground. Neither their long reſidence at Avignon, nor the great ſchiſm which took place immediately after it, tho' ſeemingly very hazardous for them, were of any material diſſervice. The eyes of princes and others were opened with reſpect to many abuſes of the papal power; but, notwithſtanding this, ſuch a power was almoſt univerſally thought to be neceſſary in the Chriſtian world. The ground of their

their claims as the *vicars of Chriſt* was never called in queſtion by any who had the power to oppoſe them.

When Edward III of England remonſtrated to Clement VI againſt his diſpoſal of biſhopricks by way of reſerve, as contrary to an act of his parliament, he anſwered, "Conſider it is not the "apoſtles, but Chriſt himſelf, who has given to "the church of Rome the ſupremacy over all the "churches in the world. It is he that inſtituted "all the patriarchates, metropolitans, and cathe-"dral churches, and all the dignities that are in "them. It is to the pope that the diſpoſal of all "theſe dignities, offices, and benefices, belongs."

Alphonſo king of Caſtile, complaining to the ſame pope in A. D. 1348, of his giving the biſhoprick of Coriæ to a foreigner, he anſwered, "Did "not the apoſtles, of whom the biſhops are the "ſucceſſors, receive a commiſſion from our Saviour "to preach to all nations? Was St. James, from "whom the Spaniards received the goſpel, a native "of Spain? Can you be ſurprized then, if the "pope follow the example of him whoſe place he "occupies on earth, and before whom there is no "diſtinction of nations, or acceptance of perſons, "and if he chuſe capable perſons, tho' ſtrangers, "to conduct the flock of Chriſt?" However, Fleury well obſerves, that a thouſand years before this

this pope Julius reproached the Orientals for making Gregory of Cappadocia biſhop of Alexandria, who was not a native of the place. When the ſame pope made many reſerves of prelacies, and abbeys, making no account of the elections of chapters and communities, and was told that his predeceſſors had not done ſuch things, he ſaid they did not know what it was to be popes. *Fleury*, Vol. 20. p. 31.

The popes did not even think themſelves bound by what themſelves had ſworn to before their election. In A. D. 1353 Innocent VI refuſed to abide by the reſtrictions that he himſelf, as well as the other cardinals, had agreed to and ſigned during the vacancy of the ſee. "That writing," he ſaid, "is a prejudice to the plenitude of power which "God himſelf with his own mouth gave to the "pope only, ſince it bounds and reſtrains it within "certain limits. This power," he ſaid, "could "not be complete, if it depended upon the con-"ſent, diſcretion, and agreement of any others; "and thoſe raſh oaths would be prejudicial to other "churches." He therefore declared that the cardinals had no power to make ſuch agreements; and ſaid, "We and our ſucceſſors the popes are "not obliged to obſerve them, or the oaths made "in conſequence of them."

Tho',

Tho', in order to put an end to the great ſchiſm which had ſo long divided the church, of which an account will be given hereafter, it was neceſſary that a general council ſhould aſſert a right of depoſing them, and its ſuperiority to them, which the council of Conſtance did in the moſt explicit manner, and Martin himſelf, who was elected pope in conſequence of that council, had aſſented to it, he was no ſooner inſtated in that dignity, than he claimed the ſame power that his predeceſſors had done. Having refuſed to condemn a treatiſe which had given offence to the Poles, they appealed to a council. But he immediately publiſhed a bull, forbidding all appeals from the ſovereign judge, or the apoſtolic ſee, or to decline its deciſion in matters of faith. This is the more extraordinary, as this pope, in his bull againſt the Huſſites in A. D. 1418, obliged them to ſwear that what had been approved or condemned by all the general councils, and eſpecially that of Conſtance, ought to be approved or condemned by all the faithful; and the ſuperiority of the council to the pope was among the decrees of this council. On this occaſion Gerſon, the chancellor of the univerſity of Paris, and who was much looked up to in all the proceedings of the council, publiſhed a treatiſe, in which he maintained that there is no ſovereign judge upon earth in matters of faith beſides

ſides a general council, alleging the decrees of this very council of Conſtance in his ſupport. Notwithſtanding this, the queſtion remained undecided among the Catholics. The Gallican church, however, held the doctrine of Gerſon. *

It is ſomething remarkable, however, that no pope in this period pretended to perſonal infallibility in matters of faith. On occaſion of the different decrees of Nicolas III and John XXII, cardinal Fournier, afterwards Benedict XII, maintained that "Nicolas did not prove from the "ſcriptures that what he advanced was true, but "that the authority of the ſcriptures had determined "John in what he had decided. And, with "reſpect to faith and manners, it is not true that "what

* Clement V made additions to the pontifical conſtitutions, which from him were called *Clementines*. John XXII and ſome of the ſucceeding popes added others, which, being miſcellaneous, and without order, were called *extravagantes*. *Giannone*, Vol. 2. p. 233.

Clement VI is ſaid to have claimed more power with reſpect to a future world than had been done, at leaſt in ſo direct a manner, by any of his predeceſſors. In his bull for the celebration of the jubilee he expreſsly commands the angels of paradice to admit thoſe who ſhould die on their journey to Rome for that purpoſe directly to the perfect glory of paradice, without letting them go thro' purgatory. But Baluzius ſays the bull is apocryphal. *Ib.* Vol. 2. p. 230.

"what has been decreed by one pope cannot be "revoked by another." On this occaſion Fleury obſerves, that the doctrine of the infallibility of the popes was not introduced into the ſchools till more than a century after this.

John XXII ſubmitted to the judgment of the church with reſpect to his favourite doctrine concerning the ſtate of the dead, and in A. D. 1351 Clement VI, apprehending that he was at the point of death, publiſhed a conſtitution, in which he ſaid that, if in teaching, preaching, or otherwiſe, any thing had eſcaped him contrary to the Catholic faith, or good morals, he revoked it, and ſubmitted to the correction of the holy ſee. Alſo, when Urban V was upon his death bed, after profeſſing his belief of the Catholic faith, he ſaid that, if he had advanced any thing contrary to it, he revoked it, and ſubmitted to the correction of the church.

The power of the popes in temporals ſeems to have been as generally acknowledged as in ſpirituals, at leaſt when it was favourable to the intereſts of the perſons concerned. But certainly no recourſe would have been had to it if his right to interfere had not been generally allowed.

Boniface VIII, in his inſtructions to his legates whom he had ſent into Hungary, to ſupport the intereſt of Charles Robert, grandſon of Charles

king

king of Naples, having heard that the lords had given the kingdom to the king of Bohemia, says, "The sovereign pontiff, established by God over "kings and kingdoms, and holding the first rank "over all mortals, judges, tranquilly from his "throne, and dissipates evils by his look. The "first king of Hungary," he said, "gave his king-"dom to the church of Rome, and would not take "his crown but from the vicar of Jesus Christ; "knowing that no person should take to himself "honour if he be not called of God." He cited all the parties to appear before him, and he reproved the king of Hungary for calling himself king of Poland; saying that that kingdom belonged to the holy see, and forbidding him to use that title, or exercise any power in that country. This pontiff took for his device *two swords* intimating that all temporal as well as all spiritual power belonged to him. *Giannone*, Vol. 2. p. 225.

The popes claimed the sovereignty of all heathen countries, and assumed the right of disposing of them as they pleased to christian princes. Thus Clement VI, in A. D. 1344, made Lewis son of Alphonso king of Castile, king of the fortunate islands, he engaging to conquer them, and establish in them the christian religion.

The popes, notwithstanding their long and hard struggles with the emperors, abated nothing

of their claims with reſpect to them, and ſtill leſs with reſpect to Naples and Sicily. On the death of the emperor Henry VII in A. D. 1313, who had declared Robert king of Naples a rebel, pope Clement V publiſhed a bull, in which he ſays that the emperor's oath to himſelf at his coronation was an oath of fealty, and that Robert, being his vaſſal, could not be guilty of treaſon to the emperor. "We therefore," he ſays, "by the ſupe-"rity which we have over the empire, the "power by which we ſucceed to the empire during "a vacancy, and, by the plenitude of power given "by Jeſus Chriſt in the perſon of St. Peter, de-"clare that ſentence null and without effect."

The papal excommunications and interdicts, tho', as we ſhall ſee, they were often diſregarded, were perhaps more frequent in this period than in any other. The king of Denmark having ill uſed the archbiſhop of Lunden, Boniface VIII excommunicated him, and laid his kingdom under an interdict in A. D. 1297; and this meaſure brought the king to make his ſubmiſſion, and give ſatisfaction to the prelate. In A. D. 1324 John XXII publiſhed a cruſade againſt Galeas Viſconti, the ſon of Matthew, who diſpoſed of the benefices in the dutchy of Milan at his own pleaſure; promiſing the ſame indulgence to thoſe who would engage in this expedition as to thoſe who went to fight

fight for the recovery of the holy land from the infidels. This family was almoſt conſtantly at variance with the popes; and tho' they often made very light of the papal cenſures, they found it neceſſary to compromiſe their differences, and buy their peace at the laſt.

The popes, beſides aſſerting their own rights, were in no want of ſtrenuous advocates. Alvar Pelagius, a Spaniſh Franciſcan, in a treatiſe publiſhed in A. D. 1329, of the *complaints of the church*, maintained that, "as Jeſus Chriſt is the ſole pontiff, king and lord of all, ſo he has but one vicar "on earth for all purpoſes. Chriſt" he ſaid, "has "not divided his power, but has given it, as he had "it himſelf; the pope is vicar not of man, but of "God, and all the earth is the Lord's and the fullneſs thereof; ſo that every king is the pope's. "The Pagan emperors," he ſaid, "never held "the empire juſtly; for he that is ſo far from God, "as an idolater, or a heretic, cannot poſſeſs any "thing juſtly under him." I do not remember to have met with any other argument in ſupport of the papal power that goes quite ſo far as this.

The pope's power in matters of literature was ſomething more plauſible than over kingdoms; and in this period it ſeems to have been taken for granted, tho' the origin of the power cannot well be traced, that no univerſity could be eſtabliſhed

without the papal authority. Thus in A. D. 1339 Benedict XII inſtituted an univerſity at Verona, for teaching law, medicine, and the arts.

The exorbitant claims of the popes were far from paſſing without oppoſition in this period, either with reſpect to argument, or methods more forcible and effectual. Marſilius of Padua, and John of Jandun, who were ſupported by Lewis of Bavaria (whoſe conteſt with the popes will be recited in another ſection) maintained in their publications, that Peter was no more the head of the church than the other apoſtles, that he had no more authority than they, and that Jeſus Chriſt made no man his vicar on earth; that it was the buſineſs of the emperor to correct and puniſh the pope, to appoint him, and to ſet him aſide; that popes, archbiſhops, and ſimple prieſts, have all equal authority by the inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt; and that neither the pope, nor the whole church, can puniſh any perſon without the authority of the emperor. Theſe propoſitions were cenſured as heretical by pope John XXII, in A. D. 1327.

But ſpirited princes oppoſed the papal claims with more effect than writers, and the haughtieſt of the popes were often obliged to give way to them. Boniface VIII, finding what offence he had given by a bull of his, forbidding the clergy to give to the princes without the conſent of the pope, limited

mited it to *forced exactions*, leaving them at liberty to make voluntary contributions for the defence of the kingdom, and even allowing the kings to require such contributions, and to be the judges of the necessity of them, which was in fact undoing what he had done before.

Edward I of England having demanded a fifth of the revenues of the clergy, they refused to pay it, pleading this bull of Boniface; but he insisted upon his demand, and seized their goods. During the contests between Bruce and Baliol for the kingdom of Scotland, Edward claimed, and conquered, the country; when this pope alleged that it belonged to him, and informed him that, if he had any pretensions to it, he must plead his cause at Rome. "For," said he, "we reserve the cogniz-"ance of all contests that are, or may be, moved "upon this subject to ourselves." Edward replied that this was not a cause to be brought before any court of justice; and giving the reasons for his claim, the pope did not think proper to urge his pretensions any farther.

During the civil wars in Hungary when Buda was laid under an interdict by those prelates who joined the party of the pope, others paid no regard to it. They even assembled the people, and excommunicated the pope and all the bishops and monks in Hungary.

When the emperor Henry VII was crowned at Rome in A. D. 1312, he had a quarrel with Robert king of Naples, and their troops fought in the city. Upon this pope Clement V ordered them to make peace. But the emperor ſaid, that tho' Robert was the vaſſal of the pope, he, as emperor, did not hold his power of him; he only owed the pope protection; and if he did not aſſert his power to do himſelf juſtice, he ſhould diminiſh the rights of that empire which he had ſworn to maintain. The pope was much offended at this anſwer, but made no further oppoſition.

When Innocent VI in A. D. 1358, ſent the biſhop of Cavaillon into Germany, to levy the tenth of all church livings for the uſe of the apoſtolic chamber, the clergy of the three provinces of Treves, Mayence, and Cologn, aſſembled, and abſolutely refuſed to contribute any thing. They wrote to the pope to give their reaſons, and he, for fear of making a ſchiſm in the church, acquieſced. On this occaſion alſo the emperor convoked the princes of the empire, where the demands of the pope were conſidered, and with great indignation refuſed. "the Romans" it was ſaid, "have always conſidered Germany as a mine of gold, and "they have invented many ways of exhauſting it. "Every year great ſums of money are carried "from Germany to Rome, for the confirmation of

"pre-

" prelates, the ſolicitation of livings, the proſecu-
" tion of appeals to the holy ſee, diſpenſations, ab-
" ſolutions, indulgences, privileges, and other fa-
" vours. Formerly the archbiſhops confirmed the
" election of the biſhops their ſuffragans; but in
" our times pope John has taken their right from
" them, and now he demands of the clergy a new
" and unheard of ſubſidy, threateniug with cen-
" ſures thoſe who will not give it. Let us ſtop
" the beginning of this evil, and not ſuffer ſo
" ſhameful a ſervitude to be eſtabliſhed."

When the kings of England were embarraſſed, they often gave way to the exorbitant claims of the popes; but this was not the caſe with Edward I, or III. Clement VI having given church livings in England to two cardinals, Edward III impriſoned their agents and drove them out of the kingdom, without paying any regard to the pope's remonſtrances. And in A. D. 1390 the parliament of England made a law forbidding any perſon to go beyond ſea to obtain any benefice, on pain of being impriſoned as a rebel.* Pope Boniface

* In the 26th of Edward III, the ſtatute of *provisors* was paſſed, by which the king, and other lords, might preſent to benefices of their own, or their anceſtor's foundation, and not the biſhops of Rome. *Neal*, Vol. 1, p. 1.

The

was much diſturbed at this, as king Richard II was a perſon he much depended upon; and he publiſhed a bull declaring the act to be null, as well as thoſe of the two Edwards to the ſame purpoſe, and ordering thoſe who were in poſſeſſion of benefices on the pretence of thoſe ordinances to quit them within two months with reſtitution of the fruits. No regard, however, was paid to this bull, and the king ordered by proclamation that all perſons poſſeſſed of benefices, who were then at the court of Rome, ſhould return to England on the pain of loſing them. Upon this the Engliſh prelates left the court of Rome with great precipitation, to the great alarm of the pope, who immediately ſent a nuncio to England; and at the next par-

The ſtatute of *præmunire*, paſſed in the 16th Richard II, enacted that if any perſon purchaſed a tranſlation to a benefice, or any other inſtrument from the court of Rome, or brought them to England, or received them there, they ſhould be out of the king's protection, and forfeit their goods ond chattels. *Neal*, Vol, 1, p, 2. From this time the archbiſhops called no more convocations by their ſole authority, but by licence from the king, their ſynods being formed by writ, or precept from the crown, directed to the archbiſhops to aſſemble their clergy, in order to conſult about ſuch affairs as he ſhould lay before them. Still, however, their canons were binding till the act of the ſubmiſſion of the clergy in the reign of Henry VIII. *Ib.*

parliament, tho' the king was diſpoſed to favour the pope, the nobles oppoſed it, but allowed of applications to Rome till their next meeting.

In A. D. 1376 there was a riſing of many of the cities belonging to the pope againſt his authority, his officers being driven out, and the people carrying a ſtandard, with the word *liberty* upon it. The Florentines having taken the lead in this revolt, Gregory XI paſſed upon them a ſentence of excommunication and interdict. He alſo forbad all perſons to have any commercial intercourſe with them, deprived them of all their privileges, and of their univerſity, confiſcated their goods, and abandoned their perſons to any who would ſeize them, as ſlaves. In conſequence of this, the Florentines eſtabliſhed at Avignon, where the pope then reſided, and alſo in other places, were obliged to return home; thoſe who were in England became ſerfs to the king, and their property came into his poſſeſſion. But at home the Florentines paid no regard to the cenſure. They were even the more animated to maintain the league, and publiſhed defamatory libels againſt the church, and the perſon of the pope, who then ſent an army againſt them under the command of Sir John Hawkwood, but this made no impreſſion upon them. The Florentines, however, ſuffering much in conſequence of the pope's meaſures, ſent Catherine of Sienna, a nun in

great reputation for ſanctity, and for her viſions, to make peace with the pope; but ſhe not being ſeconded by their own ambaſſadors, nothing was done. At length however, both parties being weary of the conteſt, another treaty was entered into when the death of Gregory put an end to it; and Urban VI, preſently after his election in A. D. 1378, took off all the cenſures from the people of Florence.

In this period, which abounded with writers, we find the power of the popes attacked in works of ſome extent, and celebrity. Dante Alighieri, the famous Italian poet, who was of the Gibelline party, was the firſt who appeared in this new field of controverſy, in three books *de Monarchia*. He was followed by Wm. Occam, the Franciſcan, in a treatiſe *De Poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica, et ſeculari*, written in defence of Philip king of France againſt Boniface VIII, and they were followed by ſeveral others in different countries of Europe. But in France the moſt ſtrenuous defender of the rights of princes againſt the popes, was Peter de Cunieres, the king's attorney general in the parliament of Autun. In conſequence of theſe writings, and the diſcuſſion which they occaſioned, the temporal juriſdiction of the clergy was much limited, eſpecially in caſes of excommunication, of ſins, and of oaths; and in Germany the *pontifical law*, eſpecially

cially that contained in the *decretals*, loſt much of its authority in the courts. *Giannone*, Vol. 2. p. 226.

The diſtance of pope John XXII from Italy, and his difference with the emperor Lewis, were the cauſes of great diſorders in Italy, where the cities were not only oppoſed to one another, but engaged in open hoſtilities and maſſacres, and all ſorts of crimes were committed. The rebels getting the upperhand, the authority of the pope, both ſpiritual and temporal, was deſpiſed. At Recanate his officers, ſent to enforce his authority, were attacked and killed, to the number of three hundred. Of thoſe who eſcaped, ſome were impriſoned, ſome dragged thro' the ſtreets, and ſome hanged, &c. On this the pope excommunicated them, and they deſpiſing this, he publiſhed a cruſade againſt them. At this time almoſt all the cities of Italy belonging to the ſee of Rome were poſſeſſed by lords and uſurpers, and it was only by ſending armies that they were reduced. Among others John de Vico, calling himſelf prefect of Rome, ſeized upon Viterbo, Toſcanella, and other places in Tuſcany; and tho' excommunicated by deſcription by John XXII, as an uſurper of lands belonging to the church, and by name by Clement VI, he deſpiſed the cenſures ſix years, on which he was declared to be *ſuſpected of hereſy*, and excom-

excommunicated again, as *contumacious in matters of faith*. At length he was reduced by the warlike cardinal Albornos.

The ſovereignty of the city of Rome, we have ſeen, was long diſputed with the popes. At the acceſſion of Clement VI the office of *ſenator* was given him for his life, but not as pope. But a more ſerious oppoſition to his civil authority in that city, tho' not avowedly ſo, was made in the time of this pope by Nicolo di Rienzi, a great enthuſiaſt, as Petrarch and many others at this time were, for the glory of antient Rome. In A. D. 1347 he got himſelf made *tribune of the people*, and aſſuming the whole authority, repreſſed injuſtice and violence, by which the citizens had long ſuffered, with great ſpirit and effect. He then proceeded to aſſert the right of the Romans to the government of the world, and the appointment of emperors, &c. But abuſing his power, he was expelled by the people, and fled to the king of Hungary. By him he was at length delivered to the emperor, and ſent a priſoner to Avignon, where he continued all the life time of Clement VI. But as it did not appear that he had done any thing againſt the church, Innocent VI ſent him in A. D. 1353 with cardinal Albornos into Italy, thinking he might be of uſe in appeaſing the troubles of that country, eſpecially at Rome, where he was ſtill in great eſteem

eſteem with many. Accordingly, finding Rome in great diſorder, and ſeveral attempts of the people to reſtore tranquility having failed, he was received with joy, and reinſtated in his former power; but again abuſing his power in a ſhocking manner, he was murdered by the people in A. D. 1354.

It was chiefly the trouble that the citizens of Rome gave to the popes, from a jealouſy of their civil power, that induced them to leave it, and at length to fix their reſidence at Avignon, where they continued more than half a century. Finding, however, many inconveniencies from their reſidence out of Italy, and being much importuned to return, Urban V in A. D. 1367 went to Italy with a view to reſide there. At Viterbo, where he ſtayed four months, deputies from Rome offered him the full ſovereignty of the city, and the poſſeſſion of the caſtle of St. Angelo; and he entered Rome on the 16th of October, which was ſixty-three years after Benedict XI left that city. His entry was made with two thouſand armed men, the clergy and the people receiving him with great ſolemnity and joy. Being, however, diſſatisfied with their conduct, he left them, and returned to Avignon. The people of Rome being determined to have a pope who ſhould reſide among them, ſent a deputation to his ſucceſſor, Gregory XI, to requeſt that he would come; and it appearing that they

they were determined upon the meaſure, and had even fixed upon anothor pope if he ſhould refuſe, he thought proper to comply with their requeſt, notwithſtanding the earneſt remonſtrances of his cardinals, and the king of France. The people of Rome promiſed him the intire ſovereignty of their city; and at the 17th of June A. D. 1377 he arrived at Rome, where he was received with every demonſtration of joy. All the lamps of the church of St. Peter were lighted on the occaſion, and they amounted to more than eight thouſand. Rome has never been without a pope ever ſince. After this, however, two attempts were made to take the ſovereignty of Rome from Boniface IX, but without effect; and the pope aſcribing them to the Colonna family, in A. D. 1400 publiſhed a violent bull againſt ſome of them, repeating all their offences from the time of Boniface VIII.

During the reſidence of the popes at Avignon, they gained ſeveral ſubſtantial advantages with reſpect to revenue and territory alſo, tho' they loſt ground in Italy. In A. D. 1306, Clement V appropriated to himſelf all the revenues of the firſt year of all benefices that ſhould be vacant in England in two years from that time, including biſhoprics, abbeys, priories, prebends, and the ſmalleſt livings; and this was the beginning of *Annatos*. Before this ſome biſhops had requeſted of the pope the

the revenues of such churches as should be vacant in their dioceses for one year, and he thought he might take to himself what he had granted to others.

John XXII got much money by the translation of bishops which had not been frequent before. In consequence of this when one bishop died many were benefitted by it, and the pope did not fail to come in for his share. *Giannone*, Vol 7 p. 229.

It appears by the letters of John XXII, that in his time Peter's pence was paid not only in England, but also thro' Wales, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Poland, tho' the origin of the claim does not appear. But the most important acquisition that was made by the popes was that of the jurisdiction of Avignon, which was granted to Clement VI for eighty thousand florins of gold, in A. D. 1348, by Joan queen of Naples, who sold it because she wanted money. Afterwards the emperor, of whom it was held, consented to give him the intire sovereignty of it.

On the accession of Benedict XI the constitution of Gregory X was observed for the first time. For the cardinals did not enter the conclave for the election of a pope till after nine days. It had been renewed by Celestine V, and confirmed by Boniface VIII.

SECTION

SECTION II.

Of the Difference between Pope Boniface VIII, with Philip le Bel King of France, and, with the Family of Colonna.

WE ſhall form a more diſtinct idea both of the ſpirit of the court of Rome, and alſo of that which by this time began to prevail among the laity, from the hiſtory of the differences between pope Boniface VIII with Philip le Bel king of France, and the family of Colonna, which I ſhall therefore ſuccinctly relate. Many of the clergy alſo, who frequently ſuffered from the encroachments of the popes, were ready to take part againſt them, and a ſpirit of free enquiry and diſcuſſion, which now prevailed, could not but be unfavourable to claims ſo exorbitant and ill founded as thoſe of the Roman pontiffs.

Boniface VIII, beſides the violence of his temper, was thought by many to have uſed unfair means to procure the reſignation of his predeceſſor Celeſtine, and therefore that his own election was liable to objection; and this circumſtance, together with a prevailing opinion of his contempt of reli-

religion, gave his enemies a conſiderable advantage againſt him. *

In the beginning of his pontificate Boniface publiſhed a bull, forbidding the clergy to pay any thing by way of ſubſidy to the temporal princes without his expreſs conſent. This, conſidering the great proportion of the lands that were then held by the clergy, and their great wealth, was thought very unreaſonable, thoſe perſons who enjoyed the moſt in any ſtate being under a natural obligation to contribute the moſt to its defence. No regard, therefore, was paid to this bull, and afterwards he limited it, as was mentioned before, to forced exactions, leaving the clergy to make what voluntary contributions they ſhould think proper.

Philip

* Great doubts were entertained of the Chriſtianity of Boniface VIII. One Nicolas depoſed, that he was preſent at a converſation about the religions of the Jews, Chriſtians, and Mahometans, when Boniface ſaid they were the invention of men, that there was no life beſides the preſent, that there is no change of the ſacramental elements in conſecration, that there is no reſurrection; and that this was not only his opinion, but that of all men of letters, tho' the ſimple and ignorant thought otherwiſe. This Nicolas declared to be ſaid by him not in jeſt, but ſeriouſly. *Fleury*, Vol. 9. p. 179.

Philip reſenting this interference of the pope in matters of civil policy, in A. D. 1296 publiſhed an ordonance, forbidding any gold, ſilver, or jewels to be carried out of the kingdom, or any ſtrangers to traffick in it. The pope, knowing that this wholly reſpected himſelf, and his agents, was exceedingly offended, and remonſtrated with the king on the ſubject, threatening him with eccleſiaſtical cenſures if he did not revoke his ordonance. This, however, the king did not do; but it was not the immediate cauſe of the rupture between them.

About the ſame time Boniface, having a difference with the two cardinals of the family of Colonna, ſummoned them to appear before him. But they refuſed to go; and went ſo far as openly to aſſert, that, the reſignation of Celeſtine being uncanonical, he was not rightful pope, and even demanded a general council to determine the queſtion. A writing expreſſing this, publiſhed May 10th, A. D. 1297, was ſigned by many perſons, eſpecially the French; and on the ſame day the pope publiſhed a bull of excommunication againſt them, depoſing them from their cardinalſhip, and ordering them once more to appear before him, under the penalty of the confiſcation of their goods. They diſregarding this, he preſently after iſſued two other bulls againſt them, and their near relations, eſpecially James Colonna, ſurnamed *Sciarra*,

ra, ordering them to be purſued as heretics. They connecting themſelves with Frederic king of Sicily, who was at open variance with the pope, and receiving his ambaſſadors in the city of Paleſtrina in A. D. 1298, the pope demoliſhed their palace, and the houſes they had in Rome; and moreover publiſhed a cruſade againſt them, with the ſame indulgences as for the war in the holy land, in order to drive them from Paleſtrina, and the other places which they held in the neighbourhood of Rome.

An army being by this means aſſembled, and Nepi taken, the Colonna's ſurrendered to the pope, and he took off the excommunication he had laid them under; but he entirely ruined and demoliſhed their caſtle at Paleſtrina. This being a violation of the terms on which they had ſurrendered, they revolted at the end of the year, when the pope reſumed his excommunication; and they, dreading his power, fled, ſome to Sicily, and others into France, where they lived in exile during all the pontificate of Boniface, and where they were materially ſerviceable to Philip in the rupture, which on the following occaſion, ſoon took place between him and the pope.

In A. D. 1301 Bernard de Saiſſet biſhop of Pamiers, having endeavoured to perſuade the count de Foix, and the count de Comminges, to revolt

from the king, and having ſaid that his city of Pamiers did not belong to the kingdom, the king, with the advice of his lords, and alſo of many doctors, both clergy and laity, cauſed him to be arreſted, and committed him as a priſoner to the archbiſhop of Narbonne his metropolitan, with the conſent of the biſhop of Senlis, and the archbiſhop of Rheims. At the ſame time the king ſent to the pope, to requeſt that he would degrade him, that he might be puniſhed as any other perſon guilty of the ſame crime.

In the mean time the pope, having heard of the tranſaction, wrote to the king, inſiſting on the biſhop being ſet at liberty, and having his goods, and thoſe of his church, reſtored to him, and that he might with all freedom come to Rome to be judged there. He alſo ordered the archbiſhop of Narbonne to releaſe the biſhop, notwithſtanding the king's orders to the contrary. At the ſame time he addreſſed another bull to the king himſelf, in which he ſays, "God has ſet us over kings and "kingdoms, to pull up and to deſtroy, to build "and to plant. Do not, therefore, perſuade your-"ſelf that you have no ſuperior, and that you are "not ſubject to the head of the eccleſiaſtical hier-"archy. He who thinks ſo is mad, and he who "maintains it obſtinately is an infidel, ſeparated "from the flock of the good paſtor." Then, after enume-

enumerating the misdemeanors of the king with respect to the clergy, and the kingdom in general, he summoned the prelates of France, and the king himself, to appear before him on the first of November.

The king, highly provoked at this, assembled the principal lords of the kingdom, ecclesiastical and secular; and on the 11th of February A. D. 1302, after publishing it by sound of trumpet thro' the city, he publicly burned the bull. Then, in a parliament held at Paris, he enumerated all the exactions and abuses of the court of Rome, which he said were increasing every day, and said that he was determined to put a stop to them. The Barons, having deliberated on the subject, declared that they were determined to bear these impositions no longer, even tho' the king should be willing to do it. But the clergy were much embarrassed, professing allegiance to the king for the fiefs they held of him, but requested leave to attend the pope, on account of the obedience they likewise owed to him. This, however, the barons declared they would by no means permit.

On this they wrote to the pope, earnestly intreating that he would revoke his order; since, if they left the kingdom, all the barons would consider them as guilty of high treason, and as to ecclesiastical censures, they despised them. The ba-

rons alſo wrote to the cardinals, appealing to them againſt the pope, and exhorting them to prevent a rupture between the holy ſee and the kingdom of France; perſuaded, they ſaid, after enumerating the encroachments of the pope on the rights of the king, that they could not approve of ſuch novelties, and ſuch a fooliſh undertaking. The cardinals in their anſwer apologized for the pope, as not having meant to claim any thing to the prejudice of the king's rights in things of a temporal nature.

Tho' no prelates attended from France, the pope held the council to which he had ſummoned them, October 30th, A. D. 1302, when he publiſhed a bull, in which he maintained that, in the church there are *two ſwords*, the one ſpiritual, employed by the pope, and the other temporal, in the hands of princes, according to the order or permiſſion of the pope; and that to hold a contrary doctrine was Manicheiſm, or that of *two principles*. He concluded with ſaying, that it was neceſſary to ſalvation, that every human being be ſubject to the pope. On the ſame day he publiſhed an excommunication againſt all thoſe who had hindered any perſon from going to Rome, tho' they ſhould be kings or emperors, which was evidently levelled at the king of France, for preventing his prelates attending that council.

The

The pope then ſent a nuncio into France, requiring of the king, among other things, to juſtify his conduct in burning his bull, under the penalty of revoking all the privileges granted by himſelf or his predeceſſors to him, his family, or his officers; and informing him that, if he did not give him ſatisfaction with reſpect to his complaint, he would proceed againſt him temporally and ſpiritually, as he ſhould judge proper. The king anſwered particularly, and without aſperity, to every article of his complaints; declaring that he had no intention to do any thing in contempt of the pope, or of the church; but the pope was by no means ſatisfied with it.

After this, the king held a council at Paris, attended by many prelates, as well as lords; when William de Nogaret, a profeſſor of law, maintained that Boniface was unjuſtly poſſeſſed of the holy ſee; that he was a manifeſt heretic, a ſimoniac, and guilty of numberleſs enormous crimes; and that he could not be tolerated but with the deſtruction of the church. He then demanded a general council for the purpoſe of depoſing him, and ſaid that, in the mean time, he ought to be ſeized and impriſoned. Laſtly, addreſſing himſelf to the king, he ſaid, "You, "Sire, are bound to do this for the maintenance "of the faith, eſpecially as a king whoſe duty it "is to exterminate all the wicked, by the oath

" that you have taken to protect the churches of " your kingdom, and by the example of your an- " ceſtors, which obliges you to deliver the Roman " church from oppreſſion."

The Pope perceiving that the difference muſt now be decided by arms, in order to ſtrengthen himſelf againſt Philip, declared his approbation of the election of Albert of Auſtria to the empire, tho' he had oppoſed him before, treating him as a rebel, and a murderer of Adolphus. But before he did this Albert acknowledged the power of the pope to create an emperor, that kings and emperors receive from the pope the power of the material ſword, and promiſed to defend the rights of the pope againſt all his enemies, and to make no alliance with them, but to make war on them if the pope ſhould order him to do ſo. The pope alſo gained Frederic king of Sicily by abſolving him from the excommunication he lay under, taking off the interdict from his kingdom, and approving his marriage; Frederic acknowledging that he held the kingdom of Sicily as vaſſal to the pope, and promiſing to pay him every year three thouſand ounces of gold. He was alſo to ſend him an hundred knights well armed, to ſerve for three months, as often as the pope ſhould have occaſion for them, and to have for friends and enemies thoſe of the church of Rome.

The

The pope, ſtrengthened by theſe alliances, declared himſelf not ſatisfied with the apology of the king; and in a letter addreſſed to the cardinal Le Main, then in France, April 13, A. D. 1303, he ordered him to denounce the king as an excommunicated perſon, and alſo thoſe who ſhould adminiſter the ſacrament to him, or celebrate maſs in his preſence, of what rank ſoever they might be, even tho' they were archbiſhops.

On this the king called a council of his nobles and prelates the 13th of June, when the principal nobility did not heſitate to declare againſt Boniface; ſaying that the church was in danger under his conduct, and that the king ought to procure the calling of a general council. But the clergy deſired time to deliberate. The next day William de Pleſſis produced a writing, containing twenty-nine articles of accuſation againſt the pope, among which were his diſbelief of the immortality of the ſoul, and of tranſubſtantiation. He alſo alleged that it was commonly ſaid that he did not believe fornication to be a ſin, that he paid no regard to the faſts of the church, but ate fleſh at all times and without any reaſon. After this he repeated his requeſt to the king and the prelates, to call a general council, and in the mean time to make their appeal to it.

On this the king recited his act of appeal, and desired the clergy to procure the calling of a council as soon as possible. However, the clergy said that they would not make themselves parties in the case, but, constrained by necessity, they joined in the appeal to a future council, and declared that if the pope should proceed against the king by excommunication, they would not be influenced by it, but defend the king, and those who adhered to him, with all their power. In return, the king promised to defend them all against the pope. Pursuing this conduct, he ordered the estates of all foreign prelates to be seized. The university and the chapter of Paris, and the Dominicans who were there, declared their adherence to the appeal, and in August and September the king had received more than seven hundred public acts of the same nature, from bishops, chapters of cathedral churches, abbots, and monks of divers orders, universities, lords, communities, and cities.

The pope hearing of this, published several bulls on the 15th of August, in which he treated the charge of heresy against himself as a mere calumny, and the calling of a council without him as a thing impossible; and concluded with threatening the king to proceed against him, and all his adherents, in a proper time and place. As these bulls could not now be delivered in the usual form

in

in France, he made a conſtitution, by which their being publiſhed in Rome was declared to be ſufficient.

In the mean time the king, having determined on his meaſures, ſent Stephen Colonna, and other Italians, men of ability and ſpirit, with Wm. De Nogaret, to ſeize the pope, and bring him to Lyons, where the council was to be held, while the pope was at Anagni, with his cardinals and his court, thinking himſelf perfectly ſafe in his native city; and there he drew up another bull, in which he ſaid that, tho', as vicar of Jeſus Chriſt, he had the power of governing kings with a rod of iron, and breaking them as a potter's veſſel, he had uſed the moſt gentle means with the king of France; but that theſe having had no effect, he now abſolved all his ſubjects from their oath of allegiance, forbidding them, under pain of anathema, to obey him, or render him any ſervice, and declaring all his treaties with other princes null.

But the day before this bull was to have been publiſhed, Sept. 7th, William de Nogaret, accompanied by Sciarra Colonna, and ſome lords of the country, with three hundred horſemen, and many foot ſoldiers, who had been ſent into the country in ſmall bodies, and in diſguiſe, entered Anagni, crying, "Long live the king of France, "and die the pope." Being then joined by the citizens,

tizens, they ſeized the pope after ſome reſiſtance, the cardinals flying, and hiding themſelves. Boniface now finding himſelf in their power, and expecting nothing leſs than death, put on his pontifical dreſs, ſaying he would die in it, and taking in his hands the keys and the croſs, placed himſelf in the pontifical chair.

In the evening Nogaret informed him of the cauſe of his ſeizure, which he aſſured him was not to offer him any violence, but to conduct him to the general council, which would be held whether he conſented to it or not. Colonna behaved with leſs reſpect, and inſulted him; but tho' they urged him much to reſign, he declared he would not, but would rather die. After ſome days, the inhabitants of Anagni, repenting of their having abandoned the pope, and perceiving the ſmall number of thoſe who had ſeized him, roſe againſt the French; crying, "Long live the pope, and "die the treators," and with ſome difficulty they drove them from the palace and the city. The pope, being now at liberty, immediately left the place, and went directly to Rome, determined to aſſemble a council, and take his full revenge on the king of France; but on the 11th of October he died, in conſequence of the mortification to which he had been expoſed.

Clement

Clement V, who ſucceeded Boniface, was a Frenchman, and before his election entered into ſeveral ſtipulations with Philip, * whoſe concurrence had great influence in his election, and in conſequence of this, he annulled all the cenſures of Boniface againſt the king; but he declined doing what the king much inſiſted upon with reſpect to that pope, whom he would have condemned as a heretic, and his bones dug up and burned.

SECTION III.

Of the Conteſts between the Popes and Lewis of Bavaria.

THE conteſt of the popes with the emperor Lewis of Bavaria was of longer continuance than that with Philip Le Bel, and ended more favour-

* On the death of Boniface there was a diſpute among the Italian and French cardinals; but it was compromiſed by the latter naming three of their countrymen, and the former chuſing one of the three. The king, being apprized of their intended choice, viz. Bertrand de Got archbiſhop of Bourdeaux, entered into ſtipulations with him, the pope engaging to grant him ſix things, five of them named at the time, and one to be mentioned afterwards.

favourably for them. Lewis, at his election in A. D. 1314, had a rival in Frederick duke of Auſtria, and the ſon of Albert; but in A. D. 1323 he defeated him in a pitched battle, and obliged him to renounce his pretenſions to the empire; ſo that he remained without a rival. But he incurred the diſpleaſure of John XXII by taking the part of the Gibellines in Italy, at the head of whom were the Viſconti's of Milan, who had been declared excommunicated and heretics. Perſiſting in this oppoſition to the pope, he was, in A. D. 1323, warned to deſiſt from the adminiſtration of the empire, and the protection of the enemies of the church, under pain of excommunication; and all perſons eccleſiaſtical and ſecular were charged, under the ſame penalty, not to obey him. Lewis remonſtrated, that he knew nothing of the hereſy of the Viſconti, but ſuppoſed that the pope conſidered thoſe as rebels to the church who were faithful to the empire, and ſaid that the pope himſelf was a favourer of heretics, in his proceedings againſt the Fratricelli, of which an account will be given hereafter. He therefore appealed, as Philip of France had done, to a general council. He alſo publiſhed in Germany, that the object of the pope was to deprive the electors of their right. This, however, the pope ſaid he was far from doing; and that the paternal hand which had raiſed them could not

mean

mean to injure them. This he said on the idea that Gregory V had given to the electors the right of chusing an emperor.

Lewis persisting in his opposition, by assisting the Gibellines in Italy, the pope, on the 15th of July A. D. 1324, published a definitive sentence against him, depriving him of his title and office, under pain of excommunication, if he did not make his submission before the first of October. But so far was Lewis from making any submission, that, in a great diet at Saxenhausen, he treated the pope as an enemy of the peace both in Italy and Germany, as having publicly said, that when the secular princes were divided, then the pope was really pope, and feared by all the world; that he considered all his enemies as heretics, especially if they were faithful to the empire. He then charged him with heresy in his condemnation of the Fratricelli, and again appealed to a general council.

In A. D. 1327 Lewis, being arrived in Italy, again denounced John XXII as a heretic, and unworthy of being pope; objecting to him sixteen articles of accusation, which he did with the advice of many bishops, other prelates, and many Franciscans; and with them was the master of the Teutonic knights, and all the schismatics. The chief of these articles of accusation was, that he was an enemy of the poverty of Jesus Christ,

in

in maintaining that he had something in property. In contempt of the pope's excommunication, he had always persons to perform divine service for him, and who moreover excommunicated the pope, calling him in derision prester John. In answer to this, the pope charged Lewis with the heresies specified in his bulls, declared him again deprived of all his dignities, and forbad any person to obey him.

Lewis entered Rome January 7th, A. D. 1328, and caused himself to be crowned emperor on the 17th, by James Albertin, who had been bishop of Castello or Venice, but had been deposed by John XXII; and after enumerating the crimes with which he charged the pope, (among which he reckoned his employing ecclesiastical persons to fight for him, his assuming temporal as well as spiritual power, which Jesus Christ had distinguished, and put into different hands; when he said, "*My kingdom is not of this world,*" and his refusing to reside in Rome) he solemnly pronounced his deposition from the papal dignity.

Before the emperor left the city James Colonna, the friend of Petrarch, distinguished himself by the boldness of his conduct in favour of the pope. Standing in the public square of St. Marcel, in the hearing of more than a thousand persons, he read a bull of the pope against Lewis, declar-

declaring that John was a Catholic and lawful pope, and Lewis and all his adherents excommunicated. He alſo offered to prove what he had advanced by reaſon, and if neceſſary by the ſword, in a proper place. Then, without oppoſition, he fixed the pope's bull to the door of the church of St. Marcell, and immediately mounting his horſe, made his eſcape.

After his coronation, Lewis proceeded to appoint another pope, and made choice of Peter Rainallucci, a Franciſcan, who took the name of Nicolas V. He publiſhed bulls againſt John, as John, in return, did againſt him. Preſently after this, the affairs of Lewis beginning to decline, he was obliged to leave Rome, and as ſoon as he was gone, the citizens returned to the obedience of John.

The pontificate of Nicolas was of no long continuance. Being ſeized by count Boniface in A. D 1330 he was delivered up to the pope at Avignon, where he made an ample confeſſion of every thing that he had done, and according to the ſtipulations with the count, his life was ſpared, and he had every indulgence that he could have in a ſtate of confinement, in which he lived three years. After this, Lewis was very deſirous of being reconciled to the pope, provided he might be acknowledged emperor, but this the pope refuſed. How-

ever the king of Bohemia, who made the propoſal for him, did not abandon him, but went into Italy, as his vicar of the empire.

The quarrel of John XXII was taken up by Clement VI, who in A. D. 1343 publiſhed a bull againſt Lewis, requiring him to deſiſt from the title of emperor, and the adminiſtration of the empire, and appear before him within three months; declaring that otherwiſe he would proceed againſt him according to the enormity of his actions. This term having expired without his making any ſubmiſſion, he was declared to be contamacious. But Lewis threatening the king of France, that if any thing was done againſt him he would conſider him as the author of it, and Philip interceding with the pope in his favour, nothing further was done againſt him at that time.

The next year Lewis was near being reconciled to the pope, but it was on the moſt humiliating terms. He conſented to confeſs all the errors and hereſies that had been laid to his charge, to renounce the empire, to reſume it as a favour from the pope, and leave himſelf, his queen, his goods and eſtates, at the pope's diſpoſal. He alſo ſwore, in the preſence of a notary ſent by the pope, that he would obſerve all theſe terms, and never revoke them. But the princes of the empire had more ſpirit than their head. They objected to theſe

theſe terms, as tending to the deſtruction of the empire, and remonſtrated with the pope on the occaſion. At this he was much offended, and proceeded to take farther meaſures againſt Lewis.

In A. D. 1346 Clement pronounced a ſentence of depoſition againſt Lewis, and invited the electors to chuſe another king of the Romans; and Charles of Luxemburg promiſing that, if he were choſen, he would fulfil all the engagements of his grandfather Henry and his predeceſſors, that he would revoke all that had been done by Lewis, that he would not take poſſeſſion of Rome or any place belonging to the church, in or out of Italy, or of the kingdoms of Sicily, Sardinia, or Corſica; that he would not even enter Rome till the day of his coronation, and leave it the day after, and that he would never return into the territories of the church without the pope's leave, he recommended him; and when he was elected, he confirmed the election, in a bull in which he ſaid "God had given to the "pope, in the perſon of St. Peter, full power of "eccleſiaſtical and terreſtrial empire."

Henry Buſman, archbiſhop of Mayence, taking the part of Lewis of Bavaria, Clement VI pronounced his depoſition, and appointed Gerlan, a ſon of the count of Naſſau, in his place; but Henry deſpiſed the ſentence of the pope, and there was a ſchiſm in that church on this account eight years,

as long as Henry lived, each of the claimants exerciſing the ſpiritual and temporal power where they prevailed, and excommunicating each other. In fact they were at open war, and by plundering and burning places, the dioceſe ſuffered ſo much, that it did not recover in an age the loſſes of theſe eight years.

Lewis, however, continued in a ſtate of contempt of the pope and his excommunications till his death, which was ſudden, on the 11th of October A. D. 1347; and notwithſtanding this, he was buried with great ceremony, as emperor, by his ſon Lewis marquis of Brandenburgh. After his death Charles was ſoon univerſally acknowledged emperor, the other competitors making terms with him.

SECTION IV.

The Hiſtory of the great Schiſm in the Weſt.

THE firm hold which the idea of the neceſſity of *a head of the church* had taken on the minds of the generality of Chriſtians was never ſo ſtrongly evidenced, as in the hiſtory of the *great ſchiſm*, which took place in the popedom on the death of Gregory XI. Had the ſun in the firmament

rament been divided into two parts, the Chriſtian world could not have been more diſturbed. Indeed, in that ſtate of mens minds, the evils which aroſe from the ſchiſm were very great; the violence of the parties againſt each other being exceſſive, and the exactions of the rival popes to augment their revenues and increaſe their power moſt oppreſſive; not to mention the many lives that were loſt in the quarrel.

No ſchiſm was productive of ſo much evil as this. The competitors, not content with thundering their anathemas againſt each other, deſolated Europe, and eſpecially Italy, with their armies, and thoſe of their partiſans. There were treaſons, poiſonings, maſſacres, aſſaſſinations, furious battles, robberies, and piracies every where. This ſchiſm was alſo the occaſion of civil wars in all the ſtates of Chriſtendom. For in the countries in which any of the competitors was generally acknowledged, there was always ſome city or community that held for the other; and frequently the ſame city and the ſame family was divided, ſo that there was no reſt or ſafety any where. *L'Enfant's Piſe*, Vol. 1. p. 50.

We ſee in the ſtrongeſt light in this hiſtory, the influence of power on the mind of man. In almoſt all the caſes of the death of any pope, choice was made of a ſucceſſor, who promiſed the faireſt

to be ready to resign his office, in order to promote the peace of the church; but in all the cases, from being apparently the most meek and unambitious of men, they proved to be the most tenacious of their power, and averse to every measure that tended to deprive them of it, notwithstanding the benefit that would manifestly have accrued to the church, and to the world, from their cession.

Many had been the attempts of the people of Rome to bring the popes from Avignon, where they had resided near a century, to their city. But, besides that they had all been Frenchmen, they found themselves more at their ease at a distance from that turbulent city, and their power in other respects was not diminished. At length, however, Urban V yielded to their importunity, and actually went to Rome, but he returned to Avignon before his death. * Gregory XI, who also went thither,

* On the 17th of April A. D. 1370 Urban V left Rome to go to Avignon, on the pretence of negotiating a peace between the kings of France and England, tho' St. Brigitte of Sweden, a woman in great fame for her sanctity, and the founder of a new order of nuns, confirmed by this pope, told him that his resolution was a foolish one, and he would never accomplish his journey. He arrived, however, at Avignon the 24th of September, but he died the 19th of December following, before he had proceeded so far as he had intended, in order to negociate the peace.

thither, was determined to have returned, but he died before he could execute his reſolution the 27th of March A. D. 1378.

At the time of his death there were ſixteen cardinals at Rome, of whom four were Italians, ſix at Avignon, and one on a miſſion in Tuſcany. Before they proceeded to the election of a ſucceſſor to Gregory, the citizens of Rome made a ſtrong remonſtrance againſt their chuſing any other than an Italian, repreſenting to them, that during the reſidence of the popes at Avignon, the cities belonging to the church had revolted, the people having been oppreſſed by the officers, who were ſtrangers, and the revenues of the church exhauſted in wars to recover them; and that not only Rome, but all Italy, had ſuffered greatly by this means. While the cardinals were aſſembled in the conclave, the populace were exceedingly clamorous for a *Roman pope*, and after ſome debate they agreed in the choice of Barthelemi di Prignano, a native of Naples and archbiſhop of Bari; but as they had not choſen a native of Rome, they were afraid of the populace, and diſperſed. However, the magiſtrates of the city, when they were informed of the election, were well ſatisfied with it, and waited upon the new pope to pay him their reſpects, tho', in this ſtage of the buſineſs, he refuſed any other appellation than that of archbiſhop

of Bari. On this, ſix of the cardinals, who had retired to the caſtle of St. Angelo, at the requeſt of the magiſtrates, came to the palace, and joining five others, repeated the election for the greater ſafety. The new pope then accepted their nomination in the uſual form, and was enthroned by the name of Urban VI. This was April 9th, A. D. 1379.

Urban is univerſally allowed to have been a man of an excellent private character, learned, devout, and a great enemy of ſimony, but too auſtere in his manners. On the 18th of April he was ſolemnly crowned with all the uſual ceremonies, all the ſixteen cardinals aſſiſting: For the four who had gone out of Rome were returned; and for three months they all lived with Urban as pope. They, moreover, all joined in a letter to their brethren at Avignon, to inform them of their proceedings, and of their having unanimouſly elected Urban; and theſe, in their anſwer, acknowledged the election. Alſo he that was in Tuſcany, coming to Rome joined the reſt, and ſaluted Urban as pope; ſo that he was now expreſsly acknowledged by all the twenty-three cardinals of whom the college was compoſed.

It is probable, therefore, that the validity of his election would never have been diſputed, if he had not given offence by the harſhneſs of his manners.

ners. Very ſoon, however, he offended many of the cardinals by his ſevere reproaches of them for their bad morals, and eſpecially for leaving their proper churches, and reſiding at his court. But no reſentment of this appeared till the middle of May, when thirteen of the cardinals went to Anagni, on the pretence of avoiding the great heats of Rome. But when they were there, they ſaid that the election of Urban was null, as having been made through fear, and got Bernard de Sve a Gaſcon captain then at Vitubo, to be their guard. He paſſing near Rome met with many who oppoſed him, and coming to an action, he routed them, killing about five hundred. He then proceeded to Anagni, while the people of Rome took their revenge on the French who were there, killing many of them. Alſo Joan queen of Naples ſent two thouſand horſemen and one hundred foot for the defence of the pope.

The cardinals at Anagni having now obtained a protection, on the 9th of Auguſt publiſhed a declaration againſt the validity of Urban's election. And on the 27th of the ſame month they went to Forli, where the three Italian cardinals joined them, each of the three, it is ſaid, having been privately aſſured, that if he came, he would be elected. The other Italian cardinal being ill remained at Rome, where he ſoon after died. Fifteen cardi-

nals being now aſſembled, on the 20th of September, they made choice of Robert of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII. He was a man well verſed in public buſineſs, and related to moſt of the great princes of Europe. The ſix cardinals of Avignon approved of this election; and on the 13th of November the king of France, tho' after much heſitation, but with the advice of his nobles and clergy, did the ſame. His party was alſo joined by Joan queen of Naples, tho' at the firſt ſhe had approved of the election of Urban, who was ſtill favoured by the people. The obedience of Urban comprehended a great part of Italy, Germany, England, the greateſt part of the Low Countries, and Hungary. Spain continued ſome time undecided.

Clement, after his election, went to Naples; but being ill received by the people, he went by ſea to France, and took up his reſidence at Avignon, where he was received with great joy; and then he publiſhed a bull againſt Urban, as Urban had before done againſt him, promiſing the ſame indulgence to thoſe who ſhould join in a cruſade againſt him, as if they had gone to the holy land. This violence of the chiefs exaſperated the partiſans of both, and in conſequence of it many prelates in the obedience of Urban were ſeized by the favourers of Clement, and ſome of them put to death.

death. Several cities and caſtles in the kingdom of Naples and the eccleſiaſtical ſtates were taken and deſtroyed, as alſo many churches and monaſteries; and murders, pillages, and other crimes were without number. The Clementines ſuffered as much as the Urbaniſts. Many perſons took their party through fear, and many ſold their obedience for money or preferment, which of courſe produced the promotion of unworthy perſons; and the ſame evils prevailed in both obediences. Open hoſtilities were, however, chiefly confined to Italy, which was divided between the two popes. On the 30th of April Urban got poſſeſſion of the caſtle of St. Angelo, which till then had been held by the Clementines; and his partiſans alſo gained a victory over the Gaſcons, and Britons in Italy, who ſupported the intereſt of Clement. Theſe advantages were by many aſcribed to the interceſſion of St. Catherine of Sienna, who exerted herſelf greatly in favour of Urban, and who, going to Rome a little before her death, exhorted the cardinals to continue firm to his intereſt.

Urban being exceedingly provoked at the conduct of the queen of Naples in deſerting his intereſt, excommunicated her, abſolved all her ſubjects from their oath of allegiance, and declared all her goods confiſcated. To execute theſe threats, he invited Charles duke of Duras to take poſſeſſion

on

on of her kingdom; and as he was in want of money, the pope ſold a great part of the patrimony of the church, and the monaſteries in Rome, to the amount of eighty thouſand florins. He alſo ſold the gold and ſilver chalices, croſſes, images of ſaints, and other valuable things belonging to churches. But he obliged Charles to give his nephew Francis di Prignano many valuable eſtates in his kingdom. In order to guard herſelf againſt this formidable invaſion, the queen adopted Lewis duke of Anjou, and invited him to come to her aſſiſtance. But before his arrival Charles got poſſeſſion of Naples, ſeized her perſon, and ſoon after put her to death.

On the 19th of May A. D. 1380 the king of Caſtile, after much deliberation, declared for Clement; but upon condition that he ſhould appoint only natives of Caſtile to any benefices in his kingdom, not reſerve to his own uſe the revenues or goods of dying prelates, and exact no tenths, or pecuniary ſubſidies. Urban hearing of this defection of the king of Caſtile, publiſhed a violent bull againſt him, excommunicating him, depoſing him, and even ordering him to be kept a cloſe priſoner. He alſo publiſhed a cruſade againſt him, with the uſual indulgences. In this bull, which was publiſhed the 28th of March A. D. 1382, Fleury ſays Urban exhauſted all the moſt rigorous clauſes

clauſes of the Roman chancellry. And as Lewis of Anjou marched with an army againſt Charles, Urban alſo publiſhed a cruſade againſt him in the uſual terms. Theſe meaſures, however, had little effect. Some troops were indeed raiſed in England with the tenths of the church livings, and the command of them was given to the biſhop of Norwich; but inſtead of marching againſt the French, who were the chief ſupporters of Clement, he attacked the Flemings, tho' they were Urbaniſts as well as the Engliſh, and being oppoſed by the French, he returned without effecting any thing.

Urban, diſſatisfied with the conduct of Charles, chiefly becauſe he did not put his nephew into the poſſeſſion of the places he had agreed to give him, went to Naples, tho' againſt the advice of all his friends; and becauſe ſome of the cardinals did not chuſe to accompany him, he publiſhed a violent bull againſt them, threatening to deprive them of their dignities if they did not ſoon follow him. The pope, however, ſoon found reaſon to repent of the ſtep that he had taken. For tho' outwardly Charles ſhewed him all reſpect, when he arrived in Naples, he in effect kept him a priſoner, as well as his nephew, who was a man wholly abandoned to vice. While he was in Naples at this time, he took by force a nun of St. Clair, and kept her at his lodgings; and when the pope

was

was told of his diſorders, he apologized for him, as a young man, tho' he was then more than forty years old. For this outrage, however, the king had him condemned to die; but the pope interceding for him, he was not only pardoned, but a peace being made between them, he married a relation of the king.

The duke of Anjou found himſelf unable to effect any thing againſt Charles. For not being able to bring him to a battle, his army periſhed by ſickneſs or ſmall ſkirmiſhes; and at length he himſelf died of chagrin the 20th of September, leaving his pretenſions on the kingdom of Naples to his ſon Lewis who was ſcarce eight years old.

Charles, having now no rival in Italy, kept no meaſures with the pope. They were at open variance, and had no communication together, the pope chuſing to reſide at Nocera, when the king wiſhed to have him at Naples. Thither, however, he at length thought proper to go, tho' not long after he returned. The cardinals urged the pope to make his peace with the king; and not ſucceeding, ſome of them formed a ſcheme to deprive him of his power. But he being informed of it, put ſix of them into cloſe cuſtody. Being tortured by his nephew, they confeſſed the crime, and the pope deprived them of their dignities and confiſcated their goods. Afterwards he in a particularly ſolemn

lemn manner on the 15th of January A. D. 1385, excommunicated not only them, but Charles, Clement, his cardinals, and all who adhered to him.

This violent conduct of the pope provoked the king to send troops to Nocera, who plundered the villages in the neighbourhood, and seized all they could of the pope's friends. They then took the city by assault, and besieged the pope in the castle, which however he held seven months.

Raimond de Beauce coming with an army to the relief of the pope, a consistory was held in his presence, in which the cardinals who were prisoners were told, that if they would freely confess their crime, they would be forgiven; but persisting in asserting their innocence, they were kept in prison, where they suffered most dreadfully by hunger, thirst, cold, and vermin. Not satisfied with this cruelty, the pope had them put to the torture once more, but without producing any confession. After this the king promised a reward to any person who would bring the pope alive or dead, and the cardinals who were of Naples, shocked at his violence, wrote to the clergy at Rome; saying, that his conduct was the principal cause of the schism, and proposing to meet them, in order to take measures for putting an end to it, but this had no effect.

By

By the assistance of Raymond, Urban left Nocera August 8th, A. D. 1385, and carried his prisoners along with him; but one of them not being able to travel fast enough, in consequence of what he had suffered by the torture, he was by the pope's order put to death. In gallies sent by the Genoese he went first to Sicily, and then to Genoa, where he arrived September the 3d. When he was here, several attempts having been made to deliver the six cardinals, some by force, and some by intreaty, he dismissed one of them, but caused the five others to be put to death in December 6th, A. D. 1386, and soon after this he left Genoa, and went to Lucca, where he continued nine months.

In this year Urban was relieved from one of his enemies. For king Charles, having succeeded to the kingdom of Hungary, went thither, and was there murdered by the order of Elizabeth, the widow of his predecessor, who had the government of the kingdom after the death of her husband. Urban, however, was not benefited by this event. For on the death of Charles the party of Lewis of Anjou who were in the interest of Clement, got the upper hand in Naples, queen Margaret retiring to Gaeta.

At this time Urban was at Lucca, where he was urged by some of the princes of Germany to have a conference with Clement, in order to unite the

the church. But he was so far from listening to the proposal, that on the 29th of August A. D. 1387, he published a new bull, addressed to the bishops, in which he exhorted all Catholic princes to join against Clement, promising plenary indulgences as in the wars of the holy land. This, however, produced nothing in his favour, and Charles king of Navarre, who always kept himself neuter, dying the 1st of January A. D. 1387, his son declared for Clement, as also did John king of Arragon on the death of his father Peter, the fifth of the same month, so that now the whole of Spain, except Portugal, was in his obedience.

Clement discovered a better disposition than Urban. For in November A. D. 1387 he sent ambassadors to the people of Florence, desiring that they would procure the calling of a general council, in order to heal the schism in the church; promising that if he should be declared pope, he would make Urban a cardinal, and that if Urban should have the preference, he would be at his mercy. But they declined interfering in the business, as they said it belonged to the sovereign princes to call such a council, and continued in the obedience of Urban. He, pretending that the kingdom of Naples was devolved to him, on the death of king Charles, set out for that kingdom; but falling from his horse, and also not having money to pay

the troops that accompanied him, he was obliged to go to Rome, which he entered in the beginning of October, and where he died two days after.

The friends of Clement, who was a much younger man than Urban, had flattered themſelves that the ſchiſm would end with his life. But in this they were greatly diſappointed. For on the 2d of November the cardinals of Urban choſe Peter Tomacelli, the cardinal of Naples, for his ſucceſſor; and he took the name of Boniface IX. He was a man who ſpake well, but not underſtanding grammar, he could not write any thing; and being ignorant of the buſineſs of the court of Rome, he often ſigned what was preſented to him without underſtanding it. As to the ſchiſm, there was no proſpect of any termination of it; as the two popes fulminated bulls againſt each other, with equal violence, but equally without effect.

Boniface finding himſelf unable to ſupport the war that Urban had undertaken for the conqueſt of Naples, admitted the claim of Ladiſlas the ſon of Charles Duras, then ſeventeen years old, and abſolved him from all eccleſiaſtical cenſures. Lewis of Anjou, however, having embarked at Marſeilles, took poſſeſſion of Naples, and on the 10th of April gained a conſiderable advantage over the party of Ladiſlas, whom Boniface ſupported at a great expence; ſo that his finances being exhauſted, he ſold eſtates

eſtates belonging to the church, as his predeceſſor had done in ſupport of the ſather. He alſo ordered to be paid into the apoſtolic chamber half the fruits of the firſt year of all the benefices in the gift of the holy ſee. * Clement alſo, being in the ſame want of money, exacted a tenth of all the church livings in France, and even of the revenues of the univerſity of Paris, which, tho' with much reluctance, was paid. He was alſo the firſt who attempted to introduce into France the cuſtom of ſeizing the goods of deceaſed biſhops and abbots, and the revenues of churches and monaſteries during a vacancy. But Charles VI prevented it. *Giannone*, Vol. 2. p. 232.

In A. D. 1392 two Carthuſians were ſent by Boniface to Clement, and to the king of France, to propoſe an union. Clement refuſed to give them a hearing; but at length they obtained one from the king, who promiſed to do every thing in his power to promote it. Upon this the univerſity of Paris took up the queſtion, and procured ſeveral memorials to be drawn up about the beſt methods of putting an end to the ſchiſm. Theſe were re-

* It is ſaid that Boniface made *annates* perpetual, as inſeparably attached to the church of Rome; whereas his predeceſſors had required them only on particular occaſions and pretences, and as a free gift. *L'Enfant's Piſe*, p. 101.

duced to three, viz. the ceſſion of both the popes, a compromiſe between them, or a general council. But nothing would ſatisfy Boniface ſhort of the expulſion of Clement.

From this time the members of the univerſity took up the buſineſs with great zeal, and in a long diſcourſe drawn up by Nicolas de Clemangis, repreſented the ſtate of the caſe to the king, drawing an affecting picture of the evils that aroſe from the ſchiſm, ſuch as the prevalence of ſimony, in conſequence of which the moſt unworthy perſons were raiſed to eccleſiaſtical dignities, intolerable exactions on the miniſters of religion, the ſale of relicks, croſſes, and every thing of value belonging to churches, the ſale even of the ſacraments themſelves, eſpecially that of penance, the diminution of divine ſervice, the contempt of the church by Mahometans, and the encouragement of heretics. But the cardinal de Luna, ſent as a legate by Clement, and who did not wiſh for a termination of the ſchiſm, managed in ſuch a manner that the king forbad the univerſity to proceed any farther in the affairs. The diſcourſe, however, being ſent to Clement, gave him great diſturbance. From this time he was obſerved to be extremely dejected, and penſive, and ſoon after, being ſeized with an apoplexy, he died on the 16th of September A. D. 1394.

On

On this event the univerſity, and the king of France, did every thing in their power to prevent the election of another pope; but the cardinals, being determined upon it, would not open the king's letters that were ſent for the purpoſe, well knowing the purport of them. However, before they proceeded to the election, they all took an oath that in caſe of their election they would do every thing that ſhould be in their power to promote the union of the church, tho' it ſhould require their ceſſion, if the cardinals ſhould think that meaſure expedient. After this they unanimouſly choſe Peter de Luna, who took the name of Benedict XIII; he having always expreſſed the greateſt zeal for the union, and having blamed Clement for not being in earneſt about it. After his election he continued to expreſs the ſame zeal for the extinction of the ſchiſm, whatever might be the ſacrifice with reſpect to himſelf. But the whole of his ſubſequent conduct ſhewed that this was mere hypocricy, and Boniface was as little deſirous of the termination of the ſchiſm as himſelf, except by bringing the whole chriſtian world to his obedience.

The king and his council, ſeeing much time loſt in deputations and embaſſies, convoked a great aſſembly at Paris for the 2d of February A. D 1395. More than ſix hundred prelates were ſummoned,

moned, and many attended. It continued a month, and at the concluſion of it the dukes of Berry and Burgundy, the king's uncles, and the duke of Orleans, were deputed to wait upon Benedict, to requeſt that he would fix upon one of the three methods of promoting the union propoſed by the univerſity, and recommending that of ceſſion. Accordingly they waited upon him; but all that he would promiſe was, that he was ready to confer with Boniface and his cardinals on the ſubject. The cardinals approved of the method of ceſſion. The ſame was alſo more ſtrongly recommended by the univerſity of Paris, from which a letter was addreſſed to all the other univerſities in Europe on the ſubject; but the univerſity of Oxford recommended a general council.

The court of France was far from being ſatisfied with the conduct of Benedict; and the univerſity ſeeing him to be inflexible, adviſed the withdrawing of obedience from him, and drew up a ſolemn act of appeal from his cenſure to a future pope. This provoked Benedict to publiſh a bull, in which he declared that appeal to be null, as being contrary to that plenitude of power which St. Peter and his ſucceſſors had received from Chriſt, and the ſacred canons, which forbad any appeal from the holy ſee. He alſo threatened to proceed farther againſt them as their violence might deſerve.

deſerve. The univerſity then applied to the cardinals, and drew up a ſecond act of appeal.

In January A. D. 1396, ambaſſadors from ſeveral of the princes in the obedience of Boniface waited upon him, to perſuade him to adopt the method of ceſſion, and conſent to a new election; aſſuring him that Benedict would do the ſame. But he was no leſs obſtinate than his antagoniſt; replying that he was indubitably pope, and would not renounce his dignity on any conſideration. In A. D. 1398 he received a deputation from princes in both obediences, the king of France, together with the emperor ſending Peter D' Arlli archbiſhop of Cambray to perſuade him to conſent to a new election. But having adviſed with his cardinals, he would return no other anſwer than that when Benedict had reſigned, he would act in ſuch a manner as ſhould give them ſatisfaction.

On the 5th of June this year another great aſſembly of prelates and doctors met at Paris, when it was agreed to withdraw all obedience from both the popes; making proviſion for the diſpoſal of benefices, and the receipt of ſuch ſums as had been uſually paid to the pope; and the cardinals of Benedict concurred in this meaſure. But when this reſolution, to which the court acceded, was ſignified to this pontiff, he declared that he would keep his dignity until his death; and when the marſhal

of Beaucicourt was ſent to compel him to reſign, and get poſſeſſion of the city of Avignon, he ſtood a ſiege in the place the whole winter, having before hand made proviſion for ſuch an event; and he perſiſted in this reſolution, tho' many perſons about him died of the wounds they received, and for want of victuals and medicines. At length the king of Caſtile alſo withdrawing his obedience from him, he agreed to the terms propoſed by the king of France, which were to renounce the pontificate in caſe that Boniface ſhould do the ſame, or die, or be depoſed, provided that protection ſhould be given to himſelf and his friends. He was not, however, permitted to leave the palace till the union ſhould be accompliſhed.

Boniface was not treated with the ſame ſeverity, and being in want of money to ſupport himſelf and Ladiſlas, he ſold every thing that was in his gift. He moreover claimed, as a perpetual right, the firſt fruits of all church livings, and the revenues of monaſteries, whether the perſons to whom they were given lived to take poſſeſſion of them or not. Sometimes he ſold the ſame benefice to two perſons, and in order to render uſeleſs the expectative graces which he had given, he gave the ſame over again with a later date, but with a clauſe of preference; ſo that for a long time no perſon would buy of him. He afterwards recalled all his

expectative

expectative graces, even thoſe which had the clauſe of preference, and likewiſe all his plenary indulgences for the jubilee or the holy land, and all diſpenſations to the mendicants to hold church livings. But this was only a pretence for granting freſh graces, and getting more money. He was the more ſtraitened when, on the death of Charles IV, he loſt the obedience of Bohemia, by oppoſing the election of Winceſlas, and alſo that of Hungary, in conſequence of crowning Ladiſlas king of Naples.

Benedict continued four years in his palace at Avignon. But in A. D. 1403 he made his eſcape, and many of the people of that part of the country taking his part, his cardinals did the ſame, aſking his pardon on their knees for their deſertion of him. In theſe advantageous circumſtances he ſent two of the cardinals to the king, and he, on farther deliberation, and finding that Boniface retained the obedience of all his friends, he thought proper to return to his. But he would not permit the pope to make any new diſpoſition, which he inſiſted upon, of the benefices which had been conferred while the obedience was withdrawn. In this ſtate of things Benedict, willing to ſhew that the continuance of the ſchiſm was not his fault, ſent an embaſſy to Boniface. But tho' this pope gave the ambaſſadors a hearing, he was ſo much irritated by

it, that, added to the ſtone by which he had ſuffered much, he took his bed, and died October 1ſt, A. D. 1404.

This was another opportunity of cloſing the ſchiſm. But notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of the legates of Benedict, and of the king of France, the cardinals proceeded to a new election; when they choſe Coſmas de Meliorati, a native of Salmona, then very old, who took the name of Innocent VII. However, previous to the election, all the cardinals took an oath to do every thing in their power to promote the union of the church, tho' it ſhould require them to renounce the pontificate.

The people of Rome diſcovering ſome jealouſy with reſpect to their privileges, Innocent, to prevent any diſpute with them, made them ſeveral conceſſions; but as they made new demands, he was obliged to arm in his own defence, and his captains ſeizing ſome of the heads of the oppoſition, and putting them to death, the people roſe upon the courtiers, plundered their houſes, and appeared in ſuch great force that the pope fled to Viterbo. But the pope himſelf not having had any hand in the murders, the people afterwards relented in his favour; and giving up to him the ſeigniory of Rome, he returned to the city in March A. D. 1405.

For

For the purpoſe of having a conference with Innocent, Benedict went to Genoa in May; but the plague coming into that city, he returned to Marſeilles. Both the popes publiſhed writings in their own vindication, throwing the blame of the continuance of the ſchiſm on each other, but neither of them was really willing to put an end to it, when Innocent died ſuddenly the 6th of November A. D. 1406. This opportunity, however, of cloſing the ſchiſm was loſt, as well as all the former, by the cardinals again proceeding to a election. As uſual, however, they all took an oath that the perſon choſen ſhould reſign if the antipope ſhould reſign, or die; and then they choſe Angelo Corrario, a Venetian, who took the name of Gregory XII. He was a man of an excellent character, and who, as ſoon as he was choſen, expreſſed the moſt earneſt deſire to cloſe the ſchiſm; ſaying he would go to any place of conference for that purpoſe, tho' it ſhould be on foot, or in the ſmalleſt bark. His letters to Benedict and the princes of Europe expreſſed the ſame reſolution; but his ſubſequent conduct by no means correſponded to his declarations. This, however, L. Aretine, his ſecretary, aſcribed not ſo much to himſelf, as to thoſe about him, who had an intereſt in his retaining his power.

In

In A. D. 1406 the parliament of Paris, after a long debate on the ſubject, once more determined to withdraw all obedience from Benedict; and that in the mean time the church ſhould be governed as it had been during the former ſubtraction. At the ſame time, agreeably to the advice of the univerſity, the king declared that a general council ſhould be called for the reformation of the church in the head and the members. This is the firſt mention of this object, which afterwards engaged ſo much of the attention of the chriſtian world, an object that was always kept in view by the friend of religion, but always defeated by the management of thoſe who were intereſted in the continuance of the abuſes.

In conſequence of the reſolution of the parliament of Paris, ambaſſadors were ſent to Benedict: but having the liberty to act according to circumſtances, they determined not to inform him of the decree of ſubtraction, leſt it ſhould prevent the propoſed interview between the two popes, tho' the king perceived nothing but evaſion in the converſation they had with him. At length Savona was the place fixed upon for the conference, and every precaution was taken to make it ſafe for both the parties. But Gregory, tho' at firſt ſo zealous for the union, abſolutely refuſed, on a variety of idle pretences, to go to the place; and tho' the am-

baſſa-

baſſadors of the king of France anſwered all his objections, and offered themſelves as hoſtages for his ſafety, they could not prevail upon him. Unable to gain any thing from Gregory, they then applied to the ſenators of Rome, and the cardinals; and theſe promiſed that, in caſe of his death, they would not proceed to a new election, till both the colleges were united.

In the mean time Benedict, being informed of the ſcheme of ſubtraction, drew up a bull of excommunication and interdict againſt all who ſhould concur in that meaſure; and perceiving that Gregory declined the propoſed interview at Savona, he went thither, and profeſſed his readineſs to go to any other place that ſhould be fixed upon. Gregory now unable altogether to recede from his repeated profeſſions, went firſt to Viterbo, where he ſtayed three weeks, and then to Sienna where he continued the reſt of the year, amuſing his cardinals with a propoſal of ceſſion, on condition that during his life he ſhould have the title of patriarch of Conſtantinople, hold the biſhoprick of Moden and Croten in the ſtate of Venice, a priory which he had held in commendam before he was elected pope, and the archbiſhoprick of York in England. At length, however, he went to Lucca; but tho' Benedict was then advanced as far as Porto Venere, and informed him that he would

not

not wait any longer, Gregory only anſwered in terms of reproach for not coming to Piſa or Leghorn, which he had propoſed, inſtead of Savona. Being at this time farther encouraged by Ladiſlas taking poſſeſſion of Rome, he openly refuſed every overture for a compromiſe; and becauſe a Carmelite exhorted him to it in a public ſermon, he not only put him in priſon for his preſumption, but ordered that for the future no perſon ſhould preach before him till the ſermon had been examined. This conduct, ſo very different from what he had given them reaſon to expect from him, gave ſo much offence to his cardinals that they left him and went to Piſa, where they ſignified their appeal to a general council. In anſwer to this, Gregory, tho' attended only by his four new cardinals, excommunicated them all, and deprived them of their dignities. But they made light of his cenſures, and in a public writing treated him as a ſchiſmatic, a heretic, and a forerunner of Antichriſt, and moreover loaded him with every kind of perſonal abuſe.

On the publication of the bull of Benedict in A. D. 1408, the king and parliament of France ordered it to be torn in pieces, and confirmed the ſubtraction of their obedience. At the ſame time they made an application to the cardinals of Gregory, without knowing what they had done, to join

join them in an appeal to a general council. Benedict hearing of this, and that the king had given orders to ſeize his perſon, durſt not return to France; but went by ſea to Perpignan, where he called a council to meet that year; and as four of his old cardinals had left him to join thoſe of Gregory at Piſa, he created five others in their place. Now again both the popes appealed to the world, laying the blame of the continuance of the ſchiſm on their adverſaries; and to counteract the effect of the council called by Benedict, Gregory appointed one for the year following in the province of Aquileia; but not daring to return to Rome, where the people were irritated againſt him on account of his connection with Ladiſlas, he went to Sienna, where, however, he could not ſtay long.

The cardinals of Benedict, to the number of eight, having joined thoſe of Gregory, appointed a council to meet at Piſa, to which they ſummoned both the popes, whoſe conduct they cenſured with much ſeverity; and in the mean time the clergy of France, in a national council, made regulations for the government of their church. There was at this time much difference of opinion in ſo new a ſtate of things, about the power, and the mode, of calling a general council, now that this meaſure appeared evidently neceſſary, without the

the concurrence of any pope. But in a ſolemn conſultation at Bologna and Florence, it was agreed, that it muſt be done by the cardinals of both obediences. And what had more weight, this ſcheme was approved by the ambaſſadors from France, Sicily, Portugal, England, Hungary, and Poland, who were by this time aſſembled at Piſa. The Venetians alſo declared for it. Gregory, as might have been expected, proteſted againſt it, but without any effect. Till the meeting of the propoſed council, cardinal Balthazar Coſſa, who had been appointed vicar of the church by both the colleges, forbad the acknowledgment of either of the popes. At the ſame time Gregory's nephew, the biſhop of Bologna, was driven from that city, and even in Rome itſelf no perſon called Gregory pope.

Benedict having made no reply to the firſt ſummons of his cardinals, they wrote to him again; but, in anſwer, he ſummoned them to attend his council at Perpignan, which met at All Saints, and was well attended by prelates from Spain, and even from France, notwithſtanding the guards that were placed to prevent any perſon going thither from that country. Theſe prelates, however, differing about the beſt method of reſtoring the peace of the church, they all left the place, except eighteen, who adviſed the ſending of legates to Piſa, and to agree to the meaſure that ſhould be adopted

adopted there. To this Benedict consented, and accordingly he appointed seven legates from seven different nations. As to Gregory, he could not find any place in which to hold his council.

About this time the people of Liege being divided between bishops appointed by each of the two popes, one of them retired to Maistrict, where he was besieged by his rival with an army consisting of fifty thousand men; but he was relieved by the duke of Burgundy with another army, and a battle being fought, not less than thirty-six thousand men were killed on the spot, and among them the bishop himself and his father, who were found among the slain, holding each other by the hand. This calamitous event had the good effect to alarm all Germany, and to quicken their proceedings to put an end to the schism; and for this purpose a great assembly was held at Frankfort, where deputies from the cardinals at Pisa attended, and where it was agreed to approve of that council, tho' the emperor was adverse to it.

On the 25th of March A. D. 1409 the council of Pisa was opened. It was then attended by twenty-two cardinals, twelve archbishops in person, and fourteen by deputies, eighty bishops, and the deputies of one hundred and two more, ninety abbots, the deputies of one hundred others, the procurers of two hundred more abbeys, forty-one

priors, the generals of the Dominicans, Franciſcans, Carmelites, and Auguſtines, the grandmaſter of Rhodes, and thoſe of the other military orders, the deputies of all the univerſities, and thoſe of more than an hundred cathedral churches, more than three hundred doctors of theology, and canon law, and by ambaſſadors from almoſt all the princes of Europe. The cardinal of Poitiers preſided.

After the uſual ſolemn forms of opening the council, the two popes were ſummoned, and neither of them appearing, they were, in the third ſeſſion, (March 30th) declared to be contumacious. At that time, in anſwer to thoſe who ſaid that a council could not be called without a pope, Gerſon, chancellor of the univerſity of Paris, delivered a diſcourſe, in which he ſhewed that the unity of the church conſiſted in Chriſt its head; and that if there be no vicar, in conſequence of his natural or civil death, the church has a right to chuſe an indubitable one, and that nothing is due to an uſurper, a heretic, or a ſchiſmatic.

The fourth ſeſſion was attended by many other perſons of conſequence, ſome of them from a great diſtance, as the archbiſhop of Riga, ſome from Jeruſalem, others from Sicily, the cardinal Landolf from his embaſſy to Germany, and many more doctors of theology and law from France and Italy. A

queſtion

queſtion having ariſen about the power of the newly made cardinals, it was ſaid that, in all caſes of the election of a pope, the cardinals have a right to conſult with whom they pleaſe, and to give them a right of voting; that the ſame was done in provincial councils, and that they who have embraced a neutrality are more proper judges in the caſe than thoſe who adhere to one or other of the opponents. However, the ambaſſadors of the emperor Robert maintained that it belonged to the emperor only to call a general council, and appealing to a future one, properly called, they departed. At the fifth ſeſſion, April 24th, there arrived ambaſſadors from England, from the duke of Burgundy, the count of Holland, and many others.

In the fifth ſeſſion, June 5, the council, after examining every thing relating to the ſchiſm, declared both Benedict and Gregory notorious ſchiſmatics, heretics, and guilty of perjury, that they had ſcandalized the whole church by their obſtinacy, that they were fallen from their dignity, and ſeparated from the church; and they therefore forbad all the faithful, under pain of excommunication, acknowledging or favouring them. And on the 26th they unanimouſly choſe Peter Philargi, of the iſle of Candia, a Franciſcan, who took the name of Alexander V, who immediately confirmed all that had been done in the council, and

united all the cardinals in one college. He alſo appointed another general council for the reformation of the church in its head and its members, for April A. D. 1412; after this, the council cloſed the 27th of July.

The proceedings of this council did not extinguiſh the ſchiſm. For, beſides that many perſons queſtioned its authority, the two former popes were ſtill acknowledged, Benedict in the kingdoms of Arragon, Caſtile, and Scotland, and Gregory by king Ladiſlas, and ſome cities of Italy; ſo that there were now three popes, inſtead of two. The emperor Robert alſo declared againſt Alexander, on account of his giving the title of king of the Romans to Winceſlas, when he had been ſeveral years depoſed.

Both Benedict and Gregory created new cardinals, and the latter now held his council at Udina, on Whitſuntide A. D. 1409; and tho' very few perſons attended it, he declared the election of Alexander, as well as that of all the popes at Avignon, unlawful. He promiſed, however, to reſign his dignity if the two other popes would do the ſame; and if Robert king of the Romans, Ladiſlas king of Naples, and Sigiſmond king of Hungary, would jointly call another council. This was univerſally conſidered as an evaſion; ſince thoſe three princes were at variance, and therefore

not

not likely to agree in any meaſure of the kind. The Venetians being more particularly offended at his conduct, and having given orders for apprehending him, he fled in diſguiſe to Gaieta in the dominions of Ladiſlas. On this Alexander publiſhed a bull againſt Ladiſlas for keeping up the ſchiſm, and by means of his legate, Balthazar Coſſa, he drove him out of Rome.

Alexander was far from making the reformations that were expected of him in his court, and in all reſpects he conducted himſelf in a very imprudent manner, being governed intirely by Balthazar Coſſa, who was ſuppoſed to have procured his death by a poiſoned clyſter at Bologna, whither he had perſuaded him to go, contrary to the earneſt requeſt of the people of Rome. He dying however, May 13th, A. D. 1410, Balthazar Coſſa was choſen to ſucceed him, and he took the name of John XXIII. He was a man of the moſt profligate morals, and was ſaid to have gained his election by bribing ſome of the cardinals, and threatening others; but his elevation was chiefly owing to the recommendation of Lewis of Anjou, the opponent of Ladiſlas.

In A. D. 1411 John ſummoned a general council to meet at Rome in April the year following, for the reformation of the church, and to oppoſe

Ladiſlas and Gregory. * But ſoon after this he made his peace with Ladiſlas, acknowledging him king of Naples, tho' he had before admitted the claims of Lewis of Anjou. For a ſum of money Ladiſlas had agreed to abandon Gregory, making, however, ſome ſtipulations in his favour. On this Gregory retired to Rimini, where he was protected by Charles Malateſta, who never abandoned him.

As the council called by John was not well attended, in conſequence of Ladiſlas oppoſing it, it was preſently diſſolved, or rather prorogued, and no place or time was fixed for its meeting again.

It

* A laughable circumſtance is ſaid to have happened at a council held by John XXIII at Rome, in A. D. 1412. An owl flew from ſome obſcure corner of the church, and ſeated itſelf in the middle of the dome, with its eyes fixed on the pope. At this ſome were terrified, as at an unlucky omen, and others laughed, ſaying the Holy Ghoſt appeared in a ſtrange ſhape; while the pope changed colour, and was ſo diſcompoſed, that he broke up the aſſembly. However, at the next ſeſſion the owl appeared again, and, as before, fixed its eyes on the pope; when by his order, the prelates left their ſeats to drive away the owl, and at length it was killed. This is related by Clemangis as certainly true, tho' the fact is queſtioned by others. *L'Enfant's Piſe*, Vol. 2. p. 96.

It now appeared that Ladiſlas had only amuſed the pope with a treaty, while he took the opportunity of ſeizing and plundering the city of Rome, in conſequence of which John, who had made himſelf odious by his exactions, fled to Florence, from which place he addreſſed letters to all the princes of Europe, to acquaint them with his ſituation. Not thinking himſelf ſafe in Florence, he went to Bologna, and in the mean time he negotiated with the emperor Sigiſmond about the calling of another general council, as the only effectual remedy for the evils of the church. For this purpoſe, in his public inſtructions he gave his legates unlimited powers to agree with the emperor on the place where it ſhould be held, tho' he inſtructed them privately to object to certain places that were too much in the power of the emperor. This prince fixed upon Conſtance, and the legates, having full powers, acquieſced in the nomination, tho' that was a city of the empire, and on this account the pope was exceedingly mortified. He had afterwards a conference with the emperor at Lodi, but not being able to prevail upon him to fix upon any other place, he ſummoned the council in the uſual forms, to meet there on the firſt of November A. D. 1414.

In the mean time John was relieved from the perſecution of Ladiſlas by the death of that prince,

who when he was in purſuit of him, on the way to Bologna, fell ſick, and returning to Naples, died there on the 16th of Auguſt A. D. 1414. The pope having now no wiſh to call any council, he was very unwilling to go to Conſtance; but his cardinals encouraging him, and having taken every precaution for his ſafety, eſpecially the aſſurance of protection from the archduke of Auſtria, he ſet out, and arrived there on the 28th of October. At this time there were in that city not leſs than thirty thouſand horſes belonging to perſons who were come to attend the council, and many more arrived afterwards.

This famous council was opened on the 15th of November, when John and his friends were very deſirous of beginning with a confirmation of the council of Piſa, on which his authority depended. But the French prelates inſiſted upon it that the council of Piſa having failed of anſwering its end, which was to promote the union of the church, they were not bound its decrees, and that the authority of the preſent council was independent of it. This was particularly urged by Peter D'Ailli the cardinal and archbiſhop of Cambray. This was the firſt circumſtance unfavourable to John, and ſeveral others followed. On the 24th of December the emperor, who was by no means his friend, arrived, and by his means ſuch excellent regu-

regulations were made, that tho' there were not fewer than a hundred thouſand ſtrangers in the city, there was no diſorder attending it, and the price of every thing was moderate.

It was another mortification to John, that the ambaſſadors of Benedict and Gregory, who were now arrived, were, by the advice of the cardinal of Cambray, and of the emperor, received with every mark of reſpect. Thoſe of Gregory ſaid that their maſter would reſign if Benedict and John would do the ſame, and the elector Palatine added for him, that he would do any thing to promote the union, provided that John did not preſide in the council, and was not preſent at it. This John rejected abſolutely, as, in the character of pope, he had convoked the council, and was there in perſon, for the purpoſe of reforming the church.

Had John been a man of a reſpectable character, he had ſo much the advantage of his antagoniſts in the authority of the council of Piſa, and the ſelfiſh avarice of his competitors, that he would eaſily have ſtood his ground; but the infamy of his conduct was his ruin. There were ſeveral meetings of the cardinals and other perſons at which John was not preſent, and in theſe great liberties were taken with his character, and his ceſſion, as well as that of his opponents, was recommended, as the beſt method of promoting the union. Two other

circumſtances relating to the conduct of the council deprived him of all influence in it, and put him wholly in the power of his enemies. It was agreed that ſecular doctors, and other laymen, ſhould have votes in the council, and not the prelates only; and what was ſtill more againſt him, it was agreed that the votes ſhould be by nations, and not by individuals, tho' this had never been practiced before.

Thoſe who were bent upon his expulſion alſo drew up a long liſt of accuſations againſt him, containing, as Theodoric de Niem ſays, all the mortal ſins, and an infinity of abominations beſides. They were, however, unwilling, as they ſaid, to produce it, and much approved the mode of voluntary ceſſion. At length John, perceiving their object, and their power, after ſeveral attempts to make a conditional ceſſion, to avoid the diſgrace of a formal condemnation, on account of his vices, was induced to make an abſolute one; but, as he refuſed to do it in the form of a bull, he was ſuſpected of a deſign to make his eſcape, and meaſures were taken to prevent it. However, by the aſſiſtance of the duke of Auſtria, he eluded their vigilance, and went to Schaffhauſen, whence he wrote to the emperor and the college of cardinals, aſſuring them that he had not come thither to evade his promiſe to cede the pontificate, but to give it the appearance of being more free. Not-

Notwithſtanding the flight of the pope, the emperor encouraged the council to proceed, and Gerſon delivered a diſcourſe to prove that a council is ſuperior to the pope, and may act without him. Accordingly it was decreed that, being lawfully convened, they would not diſcontinue their ſittings till the ſchiſm was extinct, and the church reformed in its head and its members. It ſoon appeared that the pope had no intention to reſign, and the cardinals ſhewed a diſpoſition to favour his prerogatives; but the council, voting by nations, adhered to their purpoſe.

The emperor being at war with the duke of Auſtria, to whom Schaffhauſen belonged, John was afraid to continue there, and went to Lauffenburg; and there, in the preſence of a notary, and a few witneſſes, he proteſted againſt all that he had done at Conſtance, as done under conſtraint; tho' at the ſame time he continued in public to declare the contrary. Upon this the council, in their fourth ſeſſion, aſſerted their right to act independently of him, and that all perſons, the popes not excepted, were obliged to obey them, that John had no power to remove the council or its officers, and that whatever he ſhould do to the prejudice of the council in his abſence, was null.

The duke of Auſtria, the protector of John, being put under the ban of the empire, the pope fled

fled to Friburgh, and thence he wrote to the emperor, promiſing to cede the pontificate, provided he might be perpetual cardinal legate of the whole church, that he might enjoy for his life the territory of Bologna, and the county of Avignon, a penſion of thirty thouſand florins, and give no account of his conduct. This extravagant propoſal convincing the council that he was not to be treated with, they addreſſed a letter to all the princes and ſtates, juſtifying their own conduct, and accuſing him. They ſent, however, a deputation to him, requiring him to return to the council, or ſend a bull of reſignation, being determined, in caſe of his refuſal, to proceed againſt him as a ſchiſmatic, and a heretic. The deputies found him at Briſac, and he promiſed to give them an anſwer the next day; but in the night he retired to Neuenburgh, a place in the neighbourhood; but the commandant of the place obliged him to return to Briſac; and there, after having an interview with the duke of Auſtria, and other friends, and finding that it was not in their power to ſupport him, he gave the count Berthold de Urſin a writing, in which he ſignified his reſignation in the proper form, but with expreſs orders not to deliver it till he received another order for that purpoſe.

On

On the return of the deputies, the council perceived that John meant nothing but to amuſe them, and the duke of Auſtria having made his peace with the emperor, John ſaw that he muſt provide for his ſafety in the beſt manner that he could. He therefore gave the count his final orders to deliver his bull of ceſſion. But his propoſals were ſo extravagant, that they paid no attention to it, and iſſued another citation for him to appear before them in their next ſeſſion, the 4th of May. They then ſent the burgrave of Nuremberg to take the charge of him. Witneſſes were then formally examined againſt him, and in their tenth ſeſſion May 14th he was declared a diſſipator of the goods of the church, a ſimoniac, a ſcandalous perſon, a diſturber of the faith, and as ſuch ſuſpended from the government of the church, both in temporals and ſpirituals.

Not content with this, in order to his depoſition, articles of acculation conſiſting of ſeventy heads, were drawn up againſt him, confirmed by the oaths of thirty-ſeven witneſſes, among whom were ten biſhops. Among other things he was accuſed of poiſoning his predeceſſor Alexander V, of having committed adultery, fornication, inceſt, and every crime of impurity; of having ſold benefices, exerciſed an intolerable tyranny at Bologna, and deſpiſed the offices of religion; and on theſe accounts

accounts he was judged to be altogether unworthy of the pontificate.

In the mean time John, not having been prevailed upon to attend the council, had been conducted to Ratolfall, where two legates from the council informed him of the decree for his ſuſpenſion. He received it with marks of humility, and ſubmiſſion, as he did that of his depoſition, which was ſent to him ſome time after; profeſſing his readineſs to reſign the pontificate, whenever the council pleaſed. He only begged that, in their final ſentence, they would reſpect his honour, his perſon, and his eſtate. After this he was conducted to the fortreſs of Gotleben, where John Hus was at that time a priſoner; and of all his domeſtics only his cook was allowed to attend him. From this place he was conducted to Heidelberg.

As Gregory expreſſed his willingneſs to reſign, but not to acknowledge the council, as not having been canonically convened, in the fourteenth ſeſſion it was called in his name, and the emperor preſided, when his reſignation was ſolemnly made in his name by his friend Charles de Malateſta. After this he was appointed to be the firſt of the cardinals, and perpetual legate of the march of Ancona, in which he continued till his death, two years after.

The

The conduct of Benedict furniſhes ſuch an example of obſtinacy as hardly occurs in the hiſtory of the human mind. Perſiſting in his refuſal to acknowledge the council, or renounce the pontificate, he was declared to be a notorious ſchiſmatic, and all the faithful were required to withdraw their obedience from him. Having, however, ſome reſpect for his private character, and wiſhing to cloſe the ſchiſm in the beſt and moſt effectual manner, the emperor himſelf was appointed to meet and confer with him at Perpignan, and there he arrived the 18th of September A. D. 1415. But Benedict, who had been there from the month of June, had left the place, and refuſed to return. He ſent, however, ſome propoſals, among which was the calling of another council, in which, after being acknowledged to be pope, he would depoſe himſelf, on condition that he ſhould be continued cardinal legate a latere, with full power, ſpiritual and temporal, in the whole extent of his obedience, and that the new council ſhould begin with cancelling all that had been done againſt him at Piſa.

Theſe terms were deemed to be ſo extravagant, that there was no thought of acceding to them, and even the kings who had hitherto continued in his obedience, ſhocked at his obſtinacy, now abandoned him. On this he retired firſt to Collieure, and thence to Paniſcola, a ſtrong place near the ſea,

ſea, and not far from Tortoſa, deſerted by all his cardinals, except thoſe of his own family. In this ſequeſtered place, at the age of eighty, he fulminated his bulls againſt the council of Conſtance, and the king of Arragon; threatening him with taking away the crown that he had given him; and on their proceeding farther againſt him at the council, he threatened that, if they gave him any more diſturbance, he would put the church into ſuch a ſtate as that it ſhould never be able to recover itſelf. Theſe and other inſtances of his obſtinacy, and his breach of promiſe, in not reſigning when his opponents did, were recited in the act of his condemnation. Notwithſtanding this, on being ſummoned for the laſt time, he treated the deputies with great haughtineſs, and declared all the members of the council heretics, favourers of ſchiſm, and ſubject to all the penalties to which ſuch perſons were ſentenced. After due attention to all the requiſite forms, ſentence of depoſition was at length pronounced againſt him in the thirty ſeventh ſeſſion, the 26th of July A. D. 1417, as a promoter of ſchiſm, a heretic, &c.

Having now diſpoſed of all the three popes, the cardinals, after many ſolemn preliminaries, proceeded to a new election, when they choſe Otho Colonna, of the antient family of Colonna, a cardinal deacon, who took the name of Martin V.

The

The emperor then entered the conclave, and kiſſed his feet, and the ceremony of crowning him immediately followed. *

Un-

* This council preſcribed a confeſſion of faith for future popes, and it may be ſeen in *L'Enfant's History of the council*, Vol 2. p. 125. In the early times it was the cuſtom of biſhops, at leaſt thoſe of the greater ſees, to ſend to their brother biſhops a confeſſion of their faith; and theſe were various, according to the hereſies that prevailed at the time. But this cuſtom had been diſcontinued from A. D. 1294, when it is ſaid that Boniface VIII gave one. The diſcontinuance was probably owing to the idea of the ſuperiority of the popes to all councils, the authority of which had always been recognized in the confeſſions. The ſuperiority of councils to the pope was clearly aſſerted on this occaſion. In the ſeventh ſeſſion it was decreed that "every perſon "of what dignity ſoever, even the papal, was obliged "to obey the council in what reſpects the faith, the ex- "tinction of ſchiſm, and the reformation of the church "in its head and its members; and that whoever diſ- "obeys it, tho' it ſhould be the pope, ſhould be puniſh- "ed according to the law." *L'Enfant's Conſtance*, Vol. 2. p. 227. The cuſtom of crowning the pope cannot be traced higher than the thirteenth century. The reaſons for the triple crown, which is firſt mentioned at the coronation of Benedict XII in the fourteenth century, are very various. *Ibid.* Vol. 2. p. 165.

Unwilling to leave any remains of the ſchiſm, even after this, another deputation was ſent to Benedict; but tho' he had only two cardinals adhering to him, he replied, that they might depend upon him for pacifying the troubles of the church, and that he was willing to confer with Martin on the ſubject. This being conſidered as an evaſion, the cardinal ambaſſador publiſhed a bull of excommunication againſt him, and his two cardinals. He continued, however, to act as pope as long as he lived, tho' confined to his caſtle of Paniſcola. But he was again ſupported by Alphonſo king of Arragon, becauſe Martin refuſed to give him the inveſtiture of the kingdom of Naples. Benedict died in A. D. 1424 at the age of ninety; but before his death he made the two cardinals who adhered to him take an oath, that they would chuſe another pope in his place. Accordingly, they choſe Gilles Mugnow, a cannon of Barcelona, who, at the requiſition of Alphonſo, accepted of the nomination, and took the name of Clement VIII. He even made a creation of cardinals. But Alphonſo making his peace with Martin, this Clement abdicated the papacy in A. D. 1429. Two of the cardinals, however, being determined to continue the ſchiſm, they firſt choſe Francis Rouera, a doctor of the canon law, and he reſigning in the requiſite forms, they agreed in the choice

choice of Martin; and thus the ſchiſm properly ended, after having continued fifty-one years.

Before this, John XXIII, after being kept in priſon four years, was releaſed at the interceſſion of the people of Florence, when he came to the neighbourhood of Parma, where he had many friends, who ſtrongly ſolicited him to reſume the pontifical functions. But inſtead of this, he went of his own accord, and made his ſubmiſſion to Martin, imploring his compaſſion, and in ſuch a manner as drew tears from all who were preſent at the ſcene. The pope received him with much affection, made him a cardinal, and dean of the ſacred college, and in all public ceremonies placed him in an elevated chair, next to himſelf. But he did not ſurvive this more than ſix months, dying the 22d of December A. D. 1418. His particular friend Coſmo de Medici, the wealthieſt man of his time, without excepting even ſovereign princes, honoured him with a magnificent funeral, and erected a ſuperb monument for him in the church of St. John at Rome.

SECTION V.

Of the State of the Clergy in this Period.

THE ſtate of the clergy was nearly the ſame in this period as in the preceding; tho' the laity in general being now better informed, their diſorders did not eſcape animadverſion. But the maxims on which the exorbitant power of the clergy, and all the abuſes complained of, were ſo generally received, that a reformation was almoſt impoſſible. In point of *argument* the clergy had generally the advantage. We find the fulleſt repreſentation of the ſtate of the clergy at the general council held by Urban V at Vienne in A. D. 1311. The principal ſource of the abuſes aroſe from the power which the popes aſſumed of diſpoſing of church livings in all parts of the world, which they almoſt always did for money, generally to ſtrangers, who never reſided, often to perſons exceedingly profligate, and very ignorant. Their power to do this was not queſtioned, only the abuſe of it was complained of; and when it was reſiſted, it was in an arbitrary manner, without ſolid reaſon. And what the popes did in the greater ſees, the ſuperior clergy did in the ſmaller benefices, which were at their diſpoſal; and it could

not

not be expected that they ſhould diſpoſe of any thing but in the manner on which they had acquired it.

Alphonſo VII king of Caſtile applying to pope John XXII, in A. D. 1330, for a contribution from the clergy, in his wars with the Moors, ſaid that formerly the clergy, from their zeal, ſerved in theſe wars, or maintained troops; but that now livings were given to ſtrangers, who were only concerned to raiſe from them all the money they could. He therefore requeſted that they might be given to native Spaniards. But he did not queſtion the pope's right to give them to whom he pleaſed.

At the council above mentioned, it was ſaid that the ſource of the evils complained of was the little care that was taken with reſpect to ordinations. A great number of unworthy perſons were admitted to ſacred orders; ſo that in many places the clergy were leſs reſpected than the Jews. Many clergymen of bad morals went to Rome, and obtained livings with cure of ſouls, in places where their irregularities were not known, which put it out of the power of well diſpoſed biſhops to reward merit in their dioceſes. Mention was made of one cathedral church, in which there were thirty prebends; but tho' the biſhop had governed the church twenty years, in which there had been more than

thirty-five vacancies, he had not had the diſpoſal of more than two of them; and there were perſons then waiting who had expectations in that church, or the promiſe of the benefices, when they ſhould be vacant.

Another great abuſe then complained of was the plurality of livings. The ſame perſon, it was ſaid, and often an incapable perſon, was poſſeſſed of four or five churches, ſometimes of twelve, which would have been ſufficient for the maintenance of fifty or ſixty men of letters; and ſometimes livings were given to children. The conſequence of this improper diſpoſal of church livings was ſaid to be the indecences of their dreſs, the extravagance of their tables, and a neglect and contempt of the ſervice of the church.

Few of the clergy, it was ſaid, were well informed with reſpect to the articles of faith or the cure of ſouls, which expoſed them to the contempt of infidels, in their conferences with them, ariſing from the neglect of the ſcriptures, and theology, and their applying to the ſubtleties of logic.

Much complaint was at the ſame time made of the juriſdiction of the clergy, which was ſaid to be committed to ignorant and contemptible perſons; and many were excommunicated for frivolous cauſes; ſo that there were often in one pariſh three or four hundred perſons in a ſtate of excommunication,

cation, in one case not less than seven hundred; whence, they said, came a contempt of church censures, and discourses injurious to the church and its ministers.

No reformation of abuses having been made in the council of Constance from which so much had been expected, in A. D. 1329 the barons of France making many complaints against the clergy, and the clergy against them; the king summoned them to appear before him, when both were heard. But the clergy previously declared that what they should say would only be for the sake of informing the king's conscience, as they did not submit to his authority, and maintained the superiority of the ecclesiastical to the temporal powers.

Among other complaints, the barons said, that the clergy, in order to extend their jurisdiction, gave the tonsure to a great number of persons, children under age, or of servile condition, or illegitimate, to persons who were married, and some that were illiterate, who applied to them for fear of being imprisoned, or punished for their crimes. In reply, the clergy said, the more persons were consecrated to God, the better he would be served; that they would guard against the abuses they mentioned, but that the lords themselves were often very importunate with them to make the ve-

ry ordinations they complained of. *Fleury*, Vol. 19. p. 429.

The barons ſaid that, if a man were taken in actual theft, and ſaid that he was a clergyman, they did not allow the things he had taken to be given to the owner, but took them to themſelves. This the clergy admitted.

The barons ſaid that, when a perſon was excommunicated the clergy exacted of him an arbitrary fine, and that many perſons were unable to pay it. The clergy replied, that they never excommunicated but for mortal ſin, which ought to be animadverted upon by corporal or pecuniary puniſhment, that in ſome caſes the fine was fixed, but in others arbitrary.

The barons ſaid that the officials took poſſeſſion of the goods of thoſe who died without wills, and diſtributed them as they pleaſed; that they alſo took upon themſelves the execution of wills, and had officers for that ſole purpoſe. The clergy replied, that, according to the canons and the laws of France, every prelate is, in his dioceſe, the legal executor of wills, and that the reſt followed of courſe.

After thus hearing of both ſides, the king promiſed that if the clergy would correct the abuſes complained of, he would not meddle with their rights; ſo that neither the council of Vienne, nor this

this appeal to the king produced any material alteration with reſpect to abuſes.

In A. D. 1351 great complaints were made in England of the gentleneſs with which the clergy who were priſoners were treated by them; ſo that their priſons were places of pleaſure to them, and they often went out worſe than they were when they went in. A law was, therefore, made, that their priſoners ſhould be reſtricted to a moderate diet, ſo that their confinement ſhould be a real puniſhment.

On the occaſion of a meeting of the princes and clergy of Germany, to conſider of the demand of pope Innocent VI in A. D. 1359, of a levy upon the clergy of that country, the emperor ſaid to one of them, "My lord biſhop, whence comes "it that the pope demands of the clergy ſo much "money, and never thinks of reforming them. "You ſee how they live; what is their pride, "avarice, and luxury."

In many caſes the popes themſelves were ſenſible of the abuſes in the ſtate of clergy, and on particular occaſions a check was put to them. So many were the evils ariſing from giving churches in *commendam*, that Clement V revoked all that he had granted; and yet from that time, Fleury ſays, they were more frequent than ever. "We "ſee clearly," ſaid this pope, "that the care of

" churches and monaſteries given in commendam " is neglected, their goods and rights diſſipated, " and thoſe who depend upon them greatly in- " jured, to the great prejudice of both their tem- " porals and ſpirituals; ſo that what was pretend- " ed to be advantageous, proves to be hurtful to " them. It is to be feared," he added, " that great " evils may ariſe from it to the church of Rome " itſelf."

Innocent VI, on his acceſſion to the pontificate in A. D. 1353, ordered that all the prelates who were then at his court ſhould reſide on their livings. He alſo revoked all commendams, and grants of a ſimilar nature, " Since experience," he ſaid, " has ſhewn, that on account of them the di- " vine ſervice and the care of ſouls is diminiſhed, " hoſpitality ill obſerved, the buildings are fallen " into ruin, and the rights of churches both ſpi- " ritual and temporal are loſt." *Fleury*, Vol. 20. p. 29.

Urban V publiſhed a bull againſt pluralities, " having learned," he ſays, " with grief, that ſome " eccleſiaſtics, ſecular and regular, held many " livings in number exceſſively odious, the cauſe " of great murmurings among the people, who " wanted paſtors." A ſimilar order was given for England, where the abuſe was probably greater than in France.

No

No perſon ever made a more liberal uſe of great wealth than William of Wikeham, biſhop of Wincheſter, in the reign of Edward III. But it will be ſeen in his *Life written by biſhop Lowth*, p. 22. &c. that beſides his many civil offices and his biſhoprick, he had in the church more than twenty other livings.

On a vacancy in the church of Sens in A. D. 1309, king Philip, wiſhing to place in it the biſhop of Cambray, requeſted it of the pope; who replied that tho' thoſe reſerves diſpleaſed him he would oblige the king. Afterwards, as Fleury ſays, theſe reſerves were the ſubject of great complaint, as they hindered canonical elections. The council of Conſtance decreed that the tranſlation of biſhops ſhould not be admitted, except for important reaſons, to be decided by a council of cardinals.

At this council much pains were taken by the emperor to procure a decree for the reformation of the church in its head and its members, before they proceeded to the election of a pope; but the cardinals and clergy oppoſed him with ſo much obſtinacy and addreſs, that he was obliged to give way. They promiſed that the new pope ſhould immediately proceed on the buſineſs of reformation, and before they left Conſtance; but afterwards they refuſed to ſtand to this; ſaying that a pope muſt not be bound. They decreed, however, that

that another general council ſhould be held five years after, another ſeven years after that, and for the future one every ten years; and that the pope might ſhorten theſe terms, but not enlarge them.

In this period, as in the preceding, we ſee on ſeveral occaſions a great contempt of the clergy and of their cenſures. At a council held at Cologn in A. D. 1309, twenty-nine articles were publiſhed, more proper, ſays Fleury, to diſcover the abuſes which then prevailed than to remedy them; and nothing was employed but thoſe cenſures which had been long deſpiſed. Vol. 19. p. 160. We ſee in them the eagerneſs of the clergy to make the moſt of their privileges, and to enlarge their acquiſitions. At this time the hatred and contempt of the clergy was ſo great, that they were often both impriſoned, and put to death, and ſometime others of the clergy would join in theſe violences againſt their brethren.

At a council held at Avignon in A. D. 1326 an account was given of ſome perſons in a ſtate of excommunication, having an idea that the prieſts who excommunicated them were adulterers, excommunicating them, lighting candles, burning ſtraw, &c. The council expreſſed its abhorrence of this inſolence; but, as before, they provided no remedy, beſides ſuch cenſures as had been deſpiſed. At the ſame time much complaint was made

of

of the hatred which the laity entertained for the clergy. It appears by a letter of Benedict XII to the kings of France and England in A. D. 1337, that there was at that time an almoſt general riſing of the laity againſt the clergy. Sometimes the clergy, in order to enforce their cenſures, had ſtones thrown againſt the houſes of thoſe whom they had excommunicated, and procured biers to be carried before them, as if they had been dead, when their cenſures were deſpiſed; but this was forbidden by the council of Avignon in A. D. 1337. It was, no doubt, found that theſe things only made their cenſures ſtill more deſpiſed.

SECTION VI.

Of the military Orders in this Period.

ONE of the moſt remarkable circumſtances in this period of our hiſtory is the extinction of the order of *Knights Templars*; and it ſeems difficult, if not impoſſible, to inveſtigate the real cauſes of it. It is true that before the year A. D. 1300 they were fallen into diſrepute, on account of their diſſolute lives; ſince to *drink like a Templar* was become proverbial. But in this reſpect it

is

is probable they were not worſe than other orders of men equally wealthy. In luxury the ſuperior clergy were, no doubt, on a par with them; but for ſome cauſe or other, and ſome think it was nothing but the wealth they were poſſeſſed of, they were become obnoxious to Philip king of France, who was evidently bent on their deſtruction. However the facts that came before the public were as follows.

A Templar and another perſon being confined for their crimes, in a caſtle in the dioceſe of Thouloufe, made confeſſion to one another; when the Templar confeſſed crimes of ſuch a nature, that his companion thought proper to inform the king of them; and the king ſoon laid the caſe before pope Clement V, who was then in France; and at a conference held at Poitiers in May A. D. 1307, the buſineſs was particularly conſidered. What paſſed at this conference does not appear, except that the king brought heavy charges againſt the Templars; and the conſequence of it was that, on the 13th of October, all who were of the order in all France were arreſted, and among them the grandmaſter John de Mola, who was then at Paris.

Some of them, being examined, confeſſed that, when they entered the order they had been obliged to deny Chriſt, and ſpit upon a crucifix; and moreover that they worſhipped the image of a head

that

that had a long beard. What is moſt extraordinary is, that the grandmaſter himſelf at this time confeſſed the denying of Chriſt. One hundred and forty were examined at Paris, and moſt of them made the ſame confeſſion; and beſides theſe impieties, they acknowledged many ſhocking impurities. Similar examinations were taken in other parts of France. That the pope did not readily enter into the king's meaſures is very evident, tho' at length he was induced to concur in them, and moreover wrote to the king of Naples, directing him to arreſt all the Templars in his kingdom in one day.

The year following the king held a parliament at Tours, where all who were preſent, having heard the confeſſions, judged the Templars worthy of death. Some of thoſe who were arreſted, not having been able to go ſo far as Poitiers, were examined by three cardinals appointed by the pope. Five of theſe were perſons of particular conſideration, viz. the grandmaſter of the Temple, the commander of Cyprus, the viſitor of France, and the two commanders of Aquitain and Normandy. Theſe all confeſſed their denial of Chriſt, or having promiſed that they would do ſo.

After this a council was ſummoned to meet at Vienne in A. D. 1311; and in the mean time orders were given for the examination of the Templars

plars in all parts of Europe; and inquisitors were appointed to assist at the examinations. In August A. D. 1309 eight commissaries appointed by the pope meeting at Paris, and all that could be collected of the order in France appearing before them, John de Mola, a relation of the grandmaster, declared that he had been of the order ten years, but that he had neither known, nor heard, any ill of it. The grandmaster himself being then again examined, and reminded of his former confession, he expressed great astonishment; and said that, if he had been at full liberty, he would not have made it, and professed his belief of the Catholic faith. In defence of his order, he said, no churches were better served than theirs, no order had given so much in alms, or had defended the church with their blood, like theirs.

At a council held at Saltzbourg in A. D. 1310, twenty Templars presented themselves, and said that, understanding that a council was to be held for the condemnation of their order, they came to declare their innocence of the crimes laid to their charge, appealing to the pope and a future council. At Paris the 11th of May this year fifty-nine Templars were burned alive, without any of them acknowledging the crimes of which they were accused, which struck the people much. A month after this nine were condemned, and burned, at

Sen-

Senlis; but at the ſtake they declared that what they had confeſſed before was not true, and that it was extorted from them by the dread of torture. On the 14th of May ſome Templars, who had engaged to defend their order before the commiſſaries of the pope at Paris, maintained that every thing that had been laid to their charge was falſe, and that thoſe who had made the confeſſions were either gained by promiſes, or did it for fear of torture and death. The Templars in the kingdom of Arragon ſtood upon their defence by arms, but the king's troops overpowered them, and took them priſoners.

When the council met at Vienne in A. D. 1311, tho' the principal object of it was the ſuppreſſion of Templars, they were not heard in their own defence, and the remonſtrance of many perſons againſt ſo unjuſt a proceeding was not regarded. Nor was the order condemned or ſuppreſſed by a public decree of the council, but only by the pope himſelf, in a private conſiſtory, and then not in the form of an abſolute definitive ſentence, but *proviſionally*; and in the ſecond ſeſſion of the council he publiſhed their ſuppreſſion, reſerving for his own diſpoſal, and that of the church, their perſons and poſſeſſions. Thus, however, was this celebrated order ſuppreſſed, after it had ſubſiſted one hundred and eighty-four years. Their poſſeſſions

were given to the knights Hoſpitallers, except thoſe in Spain, which were reſerved for the diſpoſal of the pope, and afterwards applied to maintain the wars againſt the Moors.

At a concluſion of this myſterious buſineſs, in A. D. 1313, the grandmaſter of the order, and the commander of Normandy being ſentenced to ſuffer death, ſolemnly retracted their confeſſions, and declared themſelves and their order innocent of the things that had been laid to their charge. They ſuffered with great firmneſs, perſiſting to the laſt in aſſerting their innocence, to the great aſtoniſhment of all who were preſent.

If we conſider the circumſtances of this accuſation of the Templars, it cannot but appear in the higheſt degree improbable. That there were unbelievers, and profligate perſons, among the Templars, as well as among the clergy, or monks, is very proboble; but that they ſhould make the rejection of Chriſtianity a term of admiſſion into their order, is altogether incredible; becauſe it could only have expoſed them to the indignation of all the Chriſtian world, and conſequently the loſs of all their emoluments. For a proceeding of this nature could not have been a ſecret. If the charge had been true, an unbeliever could have had no motive for voluntarily confeſſing it; and therefore nothing but hope, or fear can be ſuppoſed to have extorted

extorted it from them. Whatever, therefore, might be the guilt of the order, or of the individuals that compoſed it, it cannot be ſaid to have been ſufficiently proved, and conſequently their condemnation muſt be pronounced to have been unjuſt.

In A. D. 1318 John XXII confirmed the military *order of Chriſt* in Portugal, giving them the eſtates of the Templars in that kingdom, and in Algarva. They were to follow the rule of the Ciſtercians, according to the conſtitution of the knights of Calatrava.

Had impartial juſtice been done, it is probable that the fate of the Teutonic knights would have been the ſame with that of the Templars, and with more appearance of reaſon. For they were ſtill leſs of a religious order, being continually occupied in fighting, and acquiring territory for themſelves, and for this purpoſe engaging in wars, even with Chriſtian princes. The king of Poland having made heavy complaints to the pope of their conduct in A. D. 1339, nuncios were ſent to inquire into the grounds of them; when it appeared that they had entered that kingdom with an army, where they had made great havock; having burned nine churches, after plundering them of every thing of value. They had alſo ſeized Pomerania, and other ſtates, to which they had no right. On theſe

accounts they were excommunicated, and their abſolution reſerved for the pope himſelf.

Their differences with the kings of Poland did not end here. Being again in a ſtate of open war, they were, in A. D. 1410, defeated in a great battle, in which their grandmaſter, many generals, commanders, and others of their nobility, and not leſs than fifty or ſixty thouſand common ſoldiers, were ſlain. The year after the king of Poland made peace with them, allowing them their conqueſts in Pruſſia.

Laſtly, theſe Teutonic knights having acted tyrannically in Samogitia, which had been converted to Chriſtianity by Ladiſlas Jagellon, the inhabitants complained of them to the council of Conſtance in A. D. 1415; when it was decreed that the people of Samogitia ſhould depend upon the emperor in civil matters, and on their biſhops in ſpirituals, and the knights were ordered not to interfere in their affairs.

SECTION

SECTION VII.

Of the Fratricelli, or Spiritual Franciſcans.

A SPIRIT of inquiry and free diſcuſſion once excited, and eſpecially when ſupported by a principle of conſcience, is not eaſily quelled by authority. This the popes found with reſpect to the more rigid Franciſcans, who thought themſelves bound by the letter of their inſtitute to renounce all *property* in every thing; and who, in ſupport of it, maintained that Chriſt and the apoſtles had none. Several of the popes patroniſing the contrary doctrine, an open ſchiſm, tho' of no very alarming nature, was by this means produced in the church; and other perſons, whoſe principles went farther than thoſe of theſe Franciſcans, availing themſelves of the circumſtance, declaimed in the moſt open manner againſt the corruptions of the church of Rome, ſo as to be entitled to be claſſed with reformers, tho' they did not join themſelves to the Waldenſes, Albigenſes, or thoſe of any other particular denomination. Againſt thoſe, as well as againſt the rigid Franciſcans, the popes found it neceſſary to proceed with the greateſt ſeverity; and on their ſide they bore cruel perſecu-

tion, even unto death, with the greateſt conſtancy. In the preceding period ſeveral of the popes had taken the part of the more rigid Franciſcans, but the tendency of their principles being now more clearly ſeen, all the popes were hoſtile to them.

In the pontificate of Boniface VIII ſome perſons, who at leaſt called themſelves *Fratricelli*, or *Beguines* (apoſtates, it is ſaid, from various religious orders) pretending to have the power of giving the Holy Spirit by the impoſition of their hands and to abſolve ſinners,* and openly renouncing the church of Rome, the pope gave the moſt rigorous orders to the inquiſitors to proceed againſt them, and in A. D. 1397 he gave a ſpecial commiſſion to Matthew Chriſti, a Franciſcan monk, to diſcover and puniſh them in Abruzzo, the March of Ancona, and the neighbouring provinces.

Theſe Fratricelli generally called themſelves the *third order of Franciſcans*, or *brothers of repentance*; and by the common people they were often called *Beghards* or *Beguins*. They were much

* It is proper to mention the extravagances, as well as the vices, that the Catholic writers lay to the charge of their opponents; but when, as in this caſe, there is no other evidence to be procured, they muſt be heard with caution.

much attached to the memory of John de Oliva; ſaying that he was the greateſt doctor after the apoſtles, and calling him *St. Peter not canonized.* Being now a ſeparate ſect, they were condemned at the council of Vienne in A. D. 1312, on which occaſion they were charged with holding that in this life a man may attain to ſuch a ſtate of perfection, as to be impeccable; that in this ſtate there is no occaſion to pray, and that any indulgence may be granted to the body; ſince, *where the ſpirit is, there is liberty*; and that it is an imperfection to deſcend from this height of contemplation to think of the euchariſt. At this council biſhops and inquiſitors were ordered to ſeek out and puniſh theſe heretics. Pope Clement endeavoured to unite the different parties of Franciſcans, but thoſe who called themſelves *ſpiritual*, tho' profeſſing themſelves Catholics, paid no regard to the decree that was made for that purpoſe. They kept themſelves ſeparate; and being favoured by the people, they expelled the others from Narbonne and Beziers.

Of all the popes, John XXII had the moſt trouble with the Fratricelli. Being much of a theologian, he entered into controverſy with them; but at the ſame time he did not neglect the uſe of authority. But neither his reaſoning, nor the force that he employed was able to break the ſpirit of

theſe enthuſiaſts. Many of them being patronized by Lewis of Bavaria, who was at variance with the pope, ſet him at defiance. They were alſo favoured not only by the common people in many places, but by other perſons of conſequence, eſpecially in Sicily and Naples.

In A. D. 1317 John wrote to the king of Sicily, deſiring him to aſſiſt the ſuperior of the regular Franciſcans in bringing back thoſe who called themſelves *ſpiritual*, and had taken refuge in Sicily, charging them with holding many errors. He gave the ſame orders with reſpect to thoſe who were ſtill in Provence; but they refuſed to obey, appealing to the pope better informed. Upon this he cited before him forty-ſix from Narbonne, and ſeventeen from Beziers, and in all more than ſixty. But when he commanded them to go to the convent of their order in the city, and conform to the rules of it, with reſpect to dreſs, and other articles, concerning which he had publiſhed a conſtitution, they refuſed, and were ſent to priſon. At length, however, all of them, except twenty-five, complied with the pope's requiſition. But even theſe maintained that the pope had no power to diſpenſe with the rules of their founder, which they had ſworn to obey. Theſe Franciſcans the pope charged with deſpiſing the ſacraments of the church, and holding many other errors. In the ſame year he forbad the

the continuance of this order of Franciſcans, under pain of excommunication.

By this time theſe ſpiritual Franciſcans had formed themſelves into a regular body, and avowed doctrines peculiar to themſelves, and ſuch as greatly recommended them to the more ſerious of the common people. They ſaid there were two churches, one carnal, loaded with riches, plunged in delights, and blackened with crimes, in which the popes and the cardinals preſided; the other ſpiritual, adorned with virtue, frugal and poor, which conſiſted of themſelves, and their followers. They were alſo charged with maintaining that all eccleſiaſtical power belonged to them, that ſwearing was in all caſes unlawful, and that the world was near its end. Theſe opinions were, at leaſt, formally condemned by the pope, as held by them. At the ſame time he ordered them to be apprehended, and puniſhed as they deſerved, eſpecially Henry de Ceva, who was their ſuperior. On the other hand, they denied the pope's power to make the regulations preſcribed in his bull. Four of them being examined upon the ſubject, and perſiſting in their opinions, were burned alive, and were honoured as martyrs by thoſe of their ſect.

The great favourer of the ſpiritual Franciſcans had been pope Nicolas III, who publiſhed a conſtitution, according to which even the property of

things consumed by these mendicants was declared to belong to the pope and the church. This constitution John revoked, as useless to the friars, and disgraceful to the church, expressly renouncing that kind of property, except that of their buildings and other things of the same permanent nature. Bonnegrace of Bergamo, who was then at the court of Avignon on the part of these mendicants, appealing from this constitution as invalid, the pope caused him to be put in prison, and there he continued a whole year. In A. D. 1322 one Walter, a Hollander, a leading man among these Franciscans, and who dispersed little books in Germany, was burned at Cologne.

The year after this the pope, after long and mature consideration, and after consulting the ablest theologians in the university of Paris, published a constitution, in which he declared it to be heretical to maintain that Jesus Christ and his apostles had no property, either private or in common, or that they had no right to use the things which the scriptures say they had, or to sell, or give, or acquire, other things. But Michael de Cesena, the general of the regular Franciscans, supported by the bull of pope Nicolas, ventured to maintain the contrary doctrine. Also the famous William Occam declared against the opinion of the pope, preaching even publicly, that his

his opinion was a hereſy; and for this he was cited to appear before him.

It has been obſerved that the rigid Franciſcans were very fond of the writings of John de Oliva, in which he announced a kind of ſecond coming of Chriſt, or of *the ſpirit of truth* about the time of St. Francis, whoſe rule was condemned by the carnal church. This notion had its riſe, as was obſerved, from abbé Joachim, and carried farther by John of Parma, in his *Introduction to the everlaſting goſpel* mentioned before, and was held by many for a century afterwards. Availing themſelves of this, they maintained that St. Francis was ſent of God to raiſe the church ſunk in ruins, that evangelical perfection was only to be found in their rule, that the church of Rome was *Babylon the Great* in the Revelation, the *mother of harlots*, and the pope myſtical Antichriſt, who was to raiſe a violent perſecution againſt evangelical poverty and perfection; but that the carnal church would ſoon be deſtroyed by the church ſpiritual, and the reign of the Holy Spirit.

Such being the doctrines which theſe ſpiritual Franciſcans drew from the writings of John de Oliva, pope John in A. D. 1326, condemned theſe writings. And as, among the other predictions current among them, one was that the Saracens, and other infidels, were to be converted by them, tho'

tho' many would ſuffer martyrdom in accompliſhing it, that they were alſo to recover the ſchiſmatical Greeks, and to convert the Jews (and with theſe views many of them went into foreign countries, where they publiſhed doctrines contrary to thoſe of the church of Rome) the pope forbad any miſſionaries to be ſent into foreign countries except men of letters and prudence, and ordered that thoſe who ſhould go without leave ſhould be purſued as apoſtates.

Among the diſciples of John de Oliva was Ubertin de Caſal, who flying from the court of Rome, and being ordered to be apprehended, took refuge with Lewis of Bavaria, and joined Marſilius of Padua in writing againſt the pope. The principal object of their writings was to advance the power of the emperor, and to combat the opinions then prevailing in the ſchools concerning the power of the pope.

The whole of the oppoſition to the pope from the Franciſcans was not confined to the irregular and ſchiſmatical among them. Michael de Ceſena, the general of the regular Franciſcans, being ſummoned to appear before the pope at Avignon, maintained to his face the doctrines which he had condemned; and while a proceſs was commenced againſt him on that account, he fled to the emperor Lewis; and when the pope pronounced againſt him

him a ſentence of depoſition, and appointed another general of the order, he appealed to a future council. He was, however, depoſed by his own order at their next chapter in Paris in A. D. 1329; when they came to a final deciſion of the queſtion concerning the poverty of Chriſt, and reconciled as well as they could the different decrees of the popes on that ſubject.

In another conſtitution, publiſhed this year, the pope argued at large in defence of his opinions, in which he maintained that, when Chriſt ſaid that *his kingdom was not of this world*, he meant that it did not come from the powers of this world, but from God. Michael de Ceſena anſwered this, and ſaid that it was hereſy to maintain that Jeſus Chriſt had any property in temporal things, at the ſame time that he directed his diſciples to diveſt themſelves of them. Being at Munich in A. D. 1330, under the protection of the emperor Lewis, he addreſſed a letter to the Franciſcans in his own vindication, appealing to a future council, and enumerating the heretical errors of the pope, of which he made twelve articles, all relating to the poverty of Chriſt and the apoſtles. But at the next chapter of the order Michael and his adherents were cenſured as heretics and ſchiſmatics, and ſentenced to perpetual impriſonment; and the new general anſwered his letter.

Not-

Notwithſtanding theſe vigorous proceedings of the pope and the regular Franciſcans, thoſe who called themſelves *ſpiritual* continued to be in great numbers in ſeveral places, and acted with great ſpirit. In the ſouth of France they held regular aſſemblies, whoſe ſuperiors, lived in common, and begged publicly. In Italy there was another ſect of the ſame kind, who had a chief called *Angelo*, of the valley of Spoleto, an illiterate perſon. Theſe alſo held their aſſemblies, publiſhed divers indulgences, and heard confeſſions, tho' they were laymen. In A. D. 1332 the pope gave orders to the clergy to proſecute them in both theſe places. Michael de Ceſena had partiſans at Prague, and theſe the pope ordered to be apprehended, and ſent to him at his own expence. The queen of Naples, the wife of king Robert, favoured theſe rebellious Franciſcans, and the pope made loud complaints of it in his letters to the king.

In the beginning of the year A. D. 1333 Michael de Ceſena, conſidering himſelf as the proper general of the Franciſcans, addreſſed another letter to the order, repeating what he had written before, and in contempt of the pope, he called him *John of Cahors*; ſaying that a pope who decides contrary to the Catholic faith by the very fact incurs the puniſhment of excommunication, and the deprivation of his dignity. This letter, which was written

at

at Munich, he directed to be read frequently in their convents, and to be made as public as poſſible.

In this buſineſs of the Fratricelli, as in almoſt every other in which the popes were concerned, they, by their perſeverance, and the favour of circumſtances, ſucceeded. In A. D. 1349 many of the ſpiritual Franciſcans being carried off by the plague, moſt of the reſt made their ſubmiſſion, and among them was William Occam, the moſt diſtinguiſhed of them, and joined the regular Franciſcans. Some, however, continued to a later period, tho' they did not appear ſo openly; but when queſtioned they did not heſitate to maintain that John had no power to revoke the conſtitutions of preceding popes in their favour, or to ſuppreſs their order on any account. Two of them being apprehended in A. D. 1354 at Montpellier, and on being interrogated aſſerting theſe and other things againſt the authority of the pope, and maintaining that thoſe of their brethren who had ſuffered death were martyrs, were themſelves burned. One of them, John de Chatillon, publiſhed a declaration before he died, that John XXII was a heretic, and an enemy of the church, on account of his conſtitution againſt them, and that his ſucceſſors, who eſpouſed the ſame hereſy, were heretics,

retics, and in a ſtate of excommunication with reſpect to all other prelates who defended the Catholic faith.

SECTION VIII.

Miſcellaneous Articles relating to the Monks and the Mendicants.

IN this period, as well as in the preceding, we meet with great complaints of the diſorderly ſtate of monaſteries, and from a variety of cauſes. At the council of Vienne in A. D. 1311 complaint was made that, in conſequence of the cardinals having conventual priories and abbeys given to them, tho' they were not monks, there was a total neglect of their rules, the monks having no ſuperior to inſtruct, correct, or govern them. Hoſpitality alſo was omitted, the goods of the abbeys were diſſipated, their rights loſt, and the buildings became ruinous, to the great ſcandal of the people.

Two of the conſtitutions of Benedict XII ſhew how exceedingly relaxed were all the monaſtic orders in his time. The ſpirit of them was ſo much forgotten, that no mention is made of mental pray-

er;

er, or bodily labour; and yet Fleury ſays that theſe conſtitutions contributed to the farther relaxation of them. The great plague that ravaged all Europe in A. D. 1348 was the cauſe of much relaxation in the diſcipline of monaſteries, many of the monks being carried off by it, and the reſt neglecting their rules, ſo that the diſcipline could not be reſtored afterwards. This circumſtance affected the mendicants as well as the monks. In A. D. 1370 the monaſtery of Mount Caſſin was much declined, both in ſpirituals and temporals; being chiefly occupied by vagabond and inſolent monks, who lived a life almoſt ſecular; and their buildings were almoſt ruined by an earthquake. But it was reſtored by Urban V.

At the bare propoſal to reform the Benedictine monaſtery of Cluſen in the dioceſe of Hildeſheim, at the council of Conſtance in A. D. 1407, all the monks abandoned it, and left John of the abbey of Rheinhauſen in the dioceſe of Mayence, who had undertaken to reform it, to himſelf. He was not, however, diſcouraged, but aſſembled other monks of a better diſpoſition in another place, called St. Thomas de Bursfield, in the dioceſe of Mayence, and from this monaſtery the reformation extended gradually thro' all Germany. Two centuries after this abbey of Bursfield ſerved as a

model to two other famous abbeys, viz. St. Vannes in Lorraine, and St. Maur in France.

It appears, however, from the *Life of Petrarch* that all monaſteries were not in this diſorderly ſtate. Gerard the brother of Petrarch retired to one of the order of Carthuſians at Montrieu in the ſouth of France from a principle of devotion; and both he and the reſt of that fraternity ſeem to have led the moſt exemplary lives. When the monks were diſperſed in the great plague in A. D. 1348, and the prior urged him to fly for his life, as he himſelf did, Gerard reſolutely continued in the place, till he had buried all the thirty-four who ſtayed with him. He then remained alone with a dog to guard the houſe and the property belonging to it. After this he got leave to chuſe another prior, and to get other monks, and re-eſtabliſhed the monaſtery. Some time after this Petrarch paid him a viſit, and was much edified with the piety of thoſe monks, and greatly affected with the accounts they gave him of what they ſuffered from the depredations of the neighbouring lords and others, and for their uſe he wrote his books on the *religious life*. Petrarch himſelf was truly pious, and for the times in which he lived rationally ſo, as his writings and letters evince; and when he was at Milan he choſe his habitation near a monaſtery

naſtery for the benefit of attending the devotions of the place. *Life of Petrarch*, Vol. 3. p. 452.

In A. D. 1351 great complaint was made of the rigour with which priſoners in monaſteries were kept. Some were ſentenced to perpetual confinement, in perfect darkneſs, where they lived on nothing but bread and water, and ſaw no perſon whatever; ſo that they died of deſpair. On this account the king of France obliged the governors to make the condition of their priſoners more tolerable in many reſpects.

The complaints of the incroachment of the mendicants on the offices and emoluments of the ſecular clergy did not ceaſe with the laſt period. In A. D. 1357 there were warm diſputes between the clergy of England and the mendicants. At the head of the clergy was Richard Firrand, archbiſhop of Armach, and then chancellor of the univerſity of Oxford. Both parties appealed to pope Innocent, and the chancellor pleaded before him at Avignon November 8th, A. D. 1357. In his ſpeech he maintained that tho' Jeſus Chriſt was poor, he was never a beggar, and the rule of the order did not imply begging. Pariſhioners, he maintained, ſhould confeſs to their pariſh prieſts, rather than to the mendicants. As a proof of theſe incroachments, he ſaid that there were in his dioceſe more than two thouſand perſons, of whom hardly

forty confeſſed to him, and yet all received the ſacrament, having confeſſed, as they ſaid, to the mendicants; ſo that, he obſerved, they might juſtly be ſuſpected of abſolving perſons on condition of their being charitable to their order.

As ſome proof of this, he ſaid that, ſince the friars had the privilege of confeſſing perſons, they had built every where monaſteries like palaces, but never impoſed any alms for the repair of a pariſh church, a high road, or a bridge; nor, ſaid he, did the Franciſcans enjoin the giving of alms to the Dominicans. At the univerſity they inveighled ſo many young perſons to join them, that parents were afraid to ſend their ſons thither. In his time, he ſaid, there had been thirty thouſand ſtudents at Oxford, but then hardly ſix thouſand. They were ſo numerous, and ſo rapacious, that in all the univerſity a good book could hardly be found but among them. They bought up every thing, and their libraries were magnificently furniſhed.

He was anſwered by Roger Chenoc, a Franciſcan; but he reſted his defence almoſt wholly on the pope's bulls in favour of the order. After the pleading, the pope, without deciding definitively, publiſhed a provincial bull in favour of the mendicants, and afterwards a confirmation of all their privileges; they having, as Thomas Walſingham ſays,

ſays, ſpent much money at the court of Rome. In this conteſt with the mendicants Wickliffe, then at Oxford, particularly diſtinguiſhed himſelf.

About the beginning of the fourteenth century many of the Franciſcans ſeparated themſelves from the reſt for the ſake of a more ſtrict obſervance of their rule. Some of them had the approbation of pope Celeſtin, and were called *poor hermits*, having at their head Liberat of Meardo, and they ſettled in a ſmall iſland near Achaia. There they were much harraſſed, and perſecuted, in conſequence of being charged with many errors, eſpecially Manicheiſm, and a contempt of the papal authority, tho' nothing of this was proved againſt them. Sometimes they were confounded with the *Apoſtolics*. Many of them came to Provence, where they joined thoſe of the order who were called *ſpiritual*. Clement V appointed two cardinals to examine into the affair, and in the mean time he exempted them from all perſecution.

Two new inſtitutions in this period ſeem to have had their origin in the beſt intention, according to the ideas of devotion and virtue that prevailed in thoſe times. Eleazar, count of Arien, in the kingdom of Naples, of the noble family of Sabran in Provence, engaged with his wife to live in continence, at her propoſal, from the time of their marriage; ſhe being then twelve years of age,

and he fourteen. When he was twenty he regulated his family in the following manner. The gentlemen and knights, and alſo the ladies, married and unmarried, confeſſed every week, and received the communion every month; the ladies ſpent the morning in prayer, and works of piety, and after dinner in ſome bodily labour. Every evening there was a ſpiritual conference in his preſence, when he addreſſed them with great zeal, ſo that his houſe was more like a monaſtery than the court of a great lord. Several other perſons regulated their families after the model of this, and one biſhop. Some time after this both the count and his wife entered into the third order of St. Francis. In A. D. 1322 Robert king of Naples made him governor of Charles his eldeſt ſon. He died on an embaſſy to Paris, and was canonized after his death.

In A. D. 1384 one Gerard Groot of Deventer, a doctor of the univerſity of Paris, and a canon of Utrecht, eſtabliſhed a new order, called the *brothers of common life*, conſiſting of perſons of knowledge and piety, who lived in common, and employed themſelves in the inſtruction of youth. Thomas a Kempis wrote the life of this Gerard, and greatly applauded his inſtitution. During the ſitting of the council of Conſtance one Grabon a Dominican wrote againſt it, as unlawful, and contrary

to

to the approved orders; but Gerſon anſwered Grabon, threatening him with the reſentment of the council, in the deciſions of which his voice had the greateſt weight; and in conſequence of this he was induced to retract what he had advanced.

We do not in this period meet with many perſons of diſtinction embracing the monaſtic life, but about the year A. D. 1358, Peter, ſon of the king of Arragon, and Charles count of Alencon, couſin german of John king of France, became mendicants.

SECTION IX.

Of the Reformers in this Period prior to Wickliffe.

WE have ſeen that, in every period of this hiſtory ſince the prevalence of the great corruptions of the Catholic church, there have been perſons who ſtrenuouſly oppoſed them, and who in general were expoſed to grievous ſufferings in conſequence of that oppoſition. They may, therefore, be properly called *reformers*, whether their labours had more or leſs effect. But in this period we find reformers of ſingular eminence, and

more renowned, as their hiſtory is better known to us. Of theſe were Wickliffe in England, and John Hus and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia. But before I give an account of them, I ſhall recite what I have been able to collect concerning their predeceſſors in the North of Italy, and the South of France, to emiſſaries from whom, eſpecially from the Waldenſes, we can trace almoſt every attempt at reformation in other countries. Being perſecuted at home, and full of zeal for what they conſidered as important truth (and what, if Chriſtianity itſelf be of importance, certainly was ſo) they diſperſed themſelves into all parts of Europe, eſpecially to Flanders, where manufactures, commerce, and opulence ſoon introduced a liberal ſpirit of free inquiry; and alſo into Bohemia, and other parts moſt remote from Rome, and where, conſequently, they might expect to be more at reſt from papal perſecution.

Mention was made in the preceding period of *Segoncelli*, the chief of thoſe who were called *Apoſtolies* in the North of Italy, and of the perſecution raiſed againſt them. This did not diſcourage others from joining them, or following their example. The moſt diſtinguiſhed of thoſe was *Dulcin*, in Lombardy, who openly maintained that the church of Rome was the *whore of Babylon* in the Revelation, that no tythe ought to be given to any prieſt,

but

but ſuch as were poor like the apoſtles; that prayer has as much efficacy in a wood, or a ſtable as in a church, and that oaths are unlawful. His followers avoided as much as poſſible making a declaration of their faith, but, when compelled to it they did it in the boldeſt manner, without any regard to the conſequences, but without diſcovering their brethren. This Dulcin had not fewer than four thouſand followers. Being driven from Milan, they lived among the mountains. The pope had a cruſade preached againſt them, and ſent Dominican inquiſitors, who collected an army, and put it under the command of Rainier, biſhop of Verceil. He purſued them ſo cloſely in A. D. 1308, that a deep ſnow falling at that time, many of them periſhed of hunger and cold, including thoſe that were killed, not fewer than four hundred. About an hundred and fifty were taken priſoners, and among them Dulcin himſelf, who was afterwards put to death, his limbs ſeparated, and his bones burned. But the ſect was by no means extinguiſhed. In A. D. 1372 many of his diſciples in Sicily preſerved his bones and thoſe of his diſciples as alſo of the Fratricelli, as relicks, erected churches and chapels in their honour, and viſited them yearly in great crouds, on the anniverſaries of their death. Gregory XI wrote to the biſhops of Sicily to put a ſtop to theſe practices.

Rainier's object was to extirpate hereſy by all poſſible means. He was a native of Placenza, and had been himſelf a heretic ſeventeen years. He then became a preaching friar, and Alexander IV made him inquiſitor of Lombardy. His hopes of ſucceſs were founded on an interregnum in the empire, and a vacancy in the ſee of Milan. But he durſt not ſet his foot in the dominions of Azolino of Padua, who was a cruel tyrant, but a friend of the Patarins, as oppoſed to the pope. *Robinſon*, p. 434. 439.

The heretics were alſo openly defended by Uberto Pallavicino, who was maſter of Cremona, Placenza, Milan, and other places. He drove the inquiſitors from Milan, and baniſhed Rainier, who died in exile. About twelve years after the death of Pallavicino the preaching friars were going to burn a woman for hereſy at Parma, when the mob roſe, deſtroyed the monaſtery, and drove all the monks out of the city. Credible writers affirm that in the ſixteenth century all parts of Italy abounded with heretics. *Ib.* p. 446. 442.

The great number and reſpectability of the Waldenſes appears from the account given of them by this Rainier, who had been one of them. He ſays that "of all the ſects they were the moſt "dangerous; in the firſt place becauſe they have "continued longer than any other, ſome ſay from "the

" the time of pope Silveſter, but others from the " time of the apoſtles; ſecondly becauſe they are " more generally diſperſed, there being hardly any " country into which they have not penetrated; " and thirdly becauſe of all the ſects they have " the greateſt appearance of piety; but they in- " veigh againſt the church of Rome and the clergy, " and this draws crowds after them." *L'Enfant's Baſle*, p. 11.

In A. D. 1332 the Waldenſes were ſo numerous in Piedmont, that pope John XXII gave a commiſſion to the inquiſitor of Mantua, Albert de Caſtellain a Dominican, to proſecute them. They ſometimes aſſembled to the number of five hundred. They roſe in arms againſt the inquiſitor, and killed a clergyman, whom they ſuppoſed to have informed againſt them, and beſieged the inquiſitor himſelf in a caſtle, ſo that he was obliged to leave the country. The chief of theſe people was Martin Paſtre, who after preaching publicly, and eſcaping the inquiſitors twenty years, was at laſt apprehended.

Benedict XII, who was made pope in A. D. 1335, found heretics in various parts of the kingdom of France. There were Waldenſes in Lyonois, and Dauphiné, Fratricelli and diſciples of Dulcin in Italy, and others in Germany, Bohemia, and Dalmatia. On this account he ſent out

two

two inquisitors, one to Olmutz, and the other to Prague, both Dominicans.

In A. D. 1351 Clement VI. being informed that there were many heretics in the diocese of Embrun in Dauphiné, wrote to the bishops, the abbots, the clergy, and also to the lords and judges, requesting that they would aid the inquisitors in extirpating them.

In A. D. 1373 Gregory XI complained to the king of France of there being in his dominions many persons of the denomination of *Beghards*, or *Turlupins*, * who were no other than Waldenses, the Beghards having this name from their frequent begging or praying, as they were called Lollards, or Lullards, from their singing; *lullen*, having that meaning in Germany where that appellation was given them. In Dauphiné and the neighbouring provinces the pope said there was a great number of Waldenses protected from the inquisitors by the king's officers. In consequence of this information

* In Flanders and Artois persons in a very low and abject condition were called, by way of proverb, the *children of Turelupin, under the curse of nature*; owing it is conjectured, to the family of some person of that name having been remarkably unfortunate. Hence, by way of contempt and abhorrence, these reformers might be called Turlupins. *Beausobre in Lenfant's Basle*, p. 384.

tion the king exerted himſelf to ſtop the progreſs of theſe ſects. At Paris their cloaths and books were burned in the market place, and two of the Turlupins, one called Jeanne d'Aubenton, were burned.

Heretics, as they were called, were found beyond the bounds of Italy, or France. In A. D. 1315 ſome were diſcovered by the Dominican inquiſitors in Auſtria, and they were burned at Crems. They uſed neither baptiſm nor the Lord's ſupper, and in general deſpiſed the Roman hierarchy. They ſaid there were more than eight thouſand in Bohemia, Auſtria, and the neighbouring countries. They all died in triumph, and are ſaid to have paved the way for thoſe who came after them in Bohemia and Germany.

It is no uncommon thing to charge perſons with the ſuppoſed conſequences of their opinions. Thus they who very juſtly laid little ſtreſs on the rites of the church, the efficacy of which was ſo exceſſively magnified by the Catholics, and on all external and corporeal acts in general, and who laid the greateſt ſtreſs on inward piety, were ſuppoſed to be of opinion that all virtue and vice had ſo much their ſeat in the *mind*, as that, if *this* was in its right ſtate, the moſt impure acts of the *body* alone could not contaminate it. It is probable that ſome perſons viciouſly inclined may have drawn

drawn this conſequence from the doctrine of the diſtinction between the immaterial ſoul and the groſs body; but it is not probable that this was ever the avowed opinion of a whole ſect, and leaſt of all of thoſe who ſuffered martyrdom for their religion. In this caſe ſuch accounts are altogether incredible, tho' we frequently meet with them in the writings of their adverſaries. Thus it is ſaid that in A. D. 1356 one Berthold was condemned at Spire for maintaining, among other things, that a man may in this life arrive at ſuch a ſtate of perfection, that he ſhall have no need of prayer, or faſting, and that nothing will be ſin to him; that vocal prayer is uſeleſs to ſalvation, it being ſufficient to pray in the ſpirit, that an ignorant layman, without knowledge of books, but enlightened by God, may profit others and himſelf more than the moſt learned prieſt, and that a devout man, in taking his ordinary food, may acquire as much grace as receiving the ſacrament of the body and blood of Chriſt. There was probably nothing in this but the ſentiments of the Waldenſes perverted.

Superior learning and knowledge has often expoſed men to the perſecution of bigots. This was the caſe of Roger Bacon, in a former period, and of Arnold of Villa Nova, a famous phyſician in Spain, whoſe good ſenſe had led him to aſſert, that there was nothing but the externals of the Chriſtian

Chriſtian religion then left in the world. In A. D. 1317 he was dead, but his opinions were then condemned by the inquiſitors at Tarragona in Spain. He is ſaid to have prophecied that the end of the world would be in A. D. 1335.

The power of theſe inquiſitors was of ſuch a nature, as to be very liable to abuſe, and the civil powers in many ſtates took umbrage at the office, and laid reſtrictions on it. In A. D. 1346 the Florentines paſſed a law, and the ſame had been done at Peruſia in Spain, and in other places, that no inquiſitor ſhould meddle with any thing out of his office, or exact any fine, but only puniſh with death thoſe who were convicted of hereſy. In two years preceding this the inquiſitors had exacted more than ſeven thouſand florins from the citizens on the pretence of hereſy, when, John Villani ſays, there never were fewer heretics in the city.

Sometimes the rage of the people againſt the inquiſitors could not be reſtrained. In A. D. 1375 two inquiſitors were murdered, one at Suſa, and the other at Turin, the latter in the public ſquare, before a church, by twelve perſons. On this the pope wrote to the duke of Savoy, and the king of France, complaining of their neglecting the duties of their ſtation, and of the nobles of the country favouring the heretics. After this the inquiſitors appre-

apprehended ſo many heretics in thoſe provinces, that it was neceſſary to build more priſons; and taxes were levied to ſupport them.

SECTION X.

Of Wickliffe and his Followers.

WE have ſeen that the diſperſion of the Waldenſes was the means of exciting a ſpirit of oppoſition to the corruptions of the church of Rome in all parts of Europe. England did not eſcape this ſalutary influence; but it is probable that the greater number of thoſe who viſited England were immediately from Flanders, or Germany, from their having obtained the name of *Lollards*. Their opinions, and their zeal, were adopted by *John Wickliffe*, who was born in A. D. 1324, and educated at Oxford, where he greatly diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his application to literature, and eſpecially in the conteſt that was then carried on between the mendicant orders and the other members of that univerſity. From oppoſing the incroachments of thoſe friars, who were ſupported by the court of Rome, he was led to ſee more of the corruptions of that court, and of the

ſyſtem

ſyſtem they maintained, than perhaps he would otherwiſe have done, tho', compared with later reformers, he may be thought not to have proceeded very far. He acknowledged ſeven ſacraments, ſaying they were "tokens that may be ſeen of "things that could not be ſeen;" but he inveighed againſt the idle ceremonies of the church of Rome in the adminiſtration of them, and towards the latter part of his life, he queſtioned the doctrine of the real preſence of Chriſt in the euchariſt, but did not expreſs himſelf clearly on the ſubject. He oppoſed the doctrine of abſolution and indulgences, and tho' he believed a purgatory, and at one time was of opinion that pious prayers might be of uſe to perſons confined in it, he afterwards maintained it to be a pernicious error. He rejected prayers to ſaints, the worſhip of images, and pilgrimages.

But the greateſt offence he gave was what he advanced againſt the clergy, and the power of the church. He denied the power of excommunication; ſaying, there could be no hereſy without a bad life, and that no man can be properly excommunicated who does not firſt excommunicate himſelf. Tythes, he ſaid, were voluntary alms, and might be given or withheld at the pleaſure of the people. Church endowments he conſidered as the root of all the corruption of the clergy, and often wiſhed the church was again reduced to its primi-

tive poverty and innocence. He was ſtill more adverſe to the clergy having any ſecular employment, but preferred their being married to the obligation of living in celibacy. Peter pence he thought an iniquitous impoſition.

It does not appear that Wickliffe denied the ſupremacy of the pope, or any of the more fundamental doctrines then held by the church. He was a rigid predeſtinarian, and no doubt a trinitarian. He ſeems to have thought it wrong to take away the life of man on any account, and that war was utterly unlawful, and much more war in the name of religion, ſuch as the popes promoted during the great ſchiſm. "When," he ſaid, "will "the proud prieſt of Rome grant indulgences to "mankind to live in peace and charity, as he now "does to fight, and kill one another." That ſuch a man as this was looked upon with a jealous eye by the popes, and the friends of the hierarchy, cannot be wondered at.

In A. D. 1376 Gregory XI wrote to the archbiſhop of Canterbury, the univerſity of Oxford and the king of England, complaining of their tolerating ſo long the errors of Wickliffe, then rector of Lutterworth, and requiring that he ſhould be apprehended and examined. The errors with which he charged him were nineteen in number, ſuch as have been enumerated. Accordingly he

was

was examined by Courtney biſhop of London, when he explained his propoſitions, but did not retract any of them. But being ſupported by John of Ghent duke of Lancaſter, who attended him in perſon on this occaſion, and alſo by lord Percy, earl marſhal of England, nothing could be done againſt him.

Wickliffe, being now in great conſideration, was conſulted by the parliament about the lawfulneſs of employing the money that had been collected for the uſe of the pope, in the ſervice of the nation, and there could be no doubt but he would ſanction the meaſure the expediency of which was univerſally allowed.

But as the influence of the duke of Lancaſter declined, the enemies of Wickliffe took their advantage of it; and in A. D. 1381 the archbiſhop of Canterbury called a council, in which the opinions of Wickliffe were condemned; but he being exceedingly popular, they did not venture to do any thing againſt his perſon. However, on the 20th of June, two perſons who held his opinions were examined, and declared to be heretics, and a power was obtained of the king to arreſt and impriſon all ſuch.

Wickliffe himſelf died in peace in A. D. 1387, after ſuffering by the ſtroke of the palſy, which ſeized him two years before, as he was preaching.

He left many writings, but his chief work was the tranſlation of the Bible into Engliſh.

So numerous were the diſciples of Wickliffe that at this time it was ſaid that if two perſons were met on the road, one might be ſure that one of them was a Lollard. *Gilpin's Life of Wickliffe*, p. 54. This ſtate of things giving ſome alarm to the court of Rome, a council was held in London, in conſequence of a letter from pope Boniface IX to king Richard, in 1396, in which ſeveral articles taken from the works of Wickliffe were condemned, among which were the following; that in the time of the apoſtles the church had only prieſts and deacons; that popes, patriarchs, and biſhops, were the invention of pride; that popes, cardinals, patriarchs, archbiſhops, biſhops, their officials and deans, the monks and friars, were the agents of Antichriſt. *Fleury*, Vol. 20. p. 422.

If the tide turned againſt the followers of Wickliffe in the reign of Richard II, it did much more ſo in the following reigns of Henry IV and V, who, as their title to the crown was dubious, thought it neceſſary to pay court to the clergy. From them a power was obtained, to arreſt, impriſon, and fine, for hereſy, without waiting for the king's writ, which was neceſſary before, and often withheld. Having now the whole juriſdiction in their own hand, the perſecution againſt heretics raged with

with the greateſt violence, and many were the victims of their bigotry and intolerance.

The moſt diſtinguiſhed of theſe martyrs was lord Cobham, who in the earlier part of his life had been a great favourite with Henry V, and deſervedly ſo, as he was in all reſpects a moſt accompliſhed perſon, and uſeful to the king both in council and in the field. As, however, he was an avowed patron of the Wickliffites, and even encouraged ſcholars from Oxford by ſtipends, to propagate his doctrines in the country, he could not eſcape a proſecution. The king wiſhed to prevent it, and expoſtulated with him in private; but his reply to the king was as follows: "I ever was a "dutiful ſubject to your majeſty, and I hope ever "will be. Next to God I profeſs obedience to "my king, but as to the ſpiritual dominion of the "pope, I could never ſee on what foundation it "is claimed, nor can I pay him any obedience. "As ſure as God's word is true, to me it is fully "evident, that he is the great Antichriſt foretold "in holy writ." This bold anſwer ſhocked the king ſo much, that he left him to his fate. In his examination before the archbiſhop, he behaved with equal firmneſs; and on the ſubject of the Lord's ſupper would only ſay, that the elements contained the body and blood of Chriſt under the ſimilitude of bread and wine. Perceiving that he

gained nothing by his manly addreſs to his judges, he ſaid, aloud to the perſons preſent: "So theſe "are your guides, good people, for the moſt fla- "grant tranſgreſſions of God's moral law was I "never once called in queſtion by them. I have "expreſſed ſome diſlike to their arbitrary appoint- "ments and traditions, and I am treated with un- "paralleled ſeverity. But let them remember the "denunciations of Chriſt againſt the Phariſees. "All ſhall be fulfilled." This threw the court into ſome confuſion; but the archbiſhop keeping to the ſubject of the euchariſt, aſked him whether, after the words of conſecration, there remained any material bread. He replied, "the ſcriptures make "no mention of the word *material*. I believe "that Chriſt's body remains in the form of bread." When he was told that their doctrine was the determination of the church and holy doctors, he replied, "I know none holier than Chriſt, and the "apoſtles, and this determination is ſurely none "of theirs. It is plainly againſt ſcripture. I be- "lieve the ſcriptures, and all that is founded upon "them, but in your idle determinations I have "no belief."

Thro' the whole of his examination he behaved with equal ſpirit. When the cenſure of the church was pronounced, he ſaid, "You may condemn my "body. My ſoul you cannot hurt;" and after a

proper

proper addreſs to the people, he fell on his knees, and begged God to forgive his enemies. He was then ſent to the tower. While his adverſaries ſeemed to be irreſolute about what they ſhould do with him, he made his eſcape; and flying to Wales continued there four years. He was then, however, apprehended, on the idle pretence of having encouraged the aſſembling of twenty thouſand men in St. Giles's fields, with a view to dethrone the king; and then both as a traitor, and a heretic, he was burned alive, being ſuſpended with an iron chain, and fire put under him at Tyburn, a puniſhment which he bore with the greateſt fortitude. This was in A. D. 1414. See his *Life by Mr. Gilpin.*

In the eighth ſeſſion of the council of Conſtance forty-eight articles of the opinions of Wickliffe were condemned, and he himſelf being alſo condemned as an obſtinate heretic, his bones were ordered to be dug up and thrown away.

SECTION XI.

Of John Hus and Jerome of Prague.

THE ſteps of Wickliffe were followed with equal zeal and ability by John Hus, a native of Huſſinets, a village in Bohemia, from which he had his name. When the diſciples of Wickliffe were perſecuted in England, many of them left the country, and ſome of them went as far as Bohemia, where many of the Waldenſes, and perſons of ſimilar principles, had taken refuge before. Alſo a Bohemian nobleman, who had ſtudied at Oxford, and a great admirer of him, brought the books of Wickliffe to Bohemia. Theſe were read by many perſons, and among others by John Hus, then a young prieſt, a man of great genius, and a fluent ſpeaker, a maſter of arts in the univerſity of Prague, and preacher in a church which had been endowed by a rich citizen of the place. He had alſo a great advantage in being confeſſor to Sophia, the wife of Winceſlas king of Bohemia, and in having a great aſcendancy over her. He openly preached the doctrines of Wickliffe, and on all occaſion enlarged in his praiſe. But before this time it is ſaid that Bohemia, and even Auſtria, was full of Lollards, there being no fewer than eighty

eighty thouſand, and many of them ſealed their teſtimony againſt the corruptions of the church of Rome with their blood.

In the ſeventeenth century the Waldenſes were allowed to ſettle on the Saltz, the Lawn, and the Eger in Bohemia: nor was popery eſtabliſhed in that country till the fourteenth century, and then not by the conſent of the people, but by the power and artifice of Charles IV. Two of his chaplains endeavoured to perſuade him to curb the pope, and reform the church; but both of them were baniſhed. One of them, whoſe name was Janovius, and who had ſtudied at Paris, being a man of ſenſe, learning, and piety, was a great friend of reformation, and both preached and wrote againſt the corruptions of the times. Before he died he ſaid, "At preſent the fury of the enemies of truth "prevails againſt us, but it will not be ſo always. "Men will ariſe without ſwords or power, and "againſt them they will never be able to prevail." *Robinſon*, p. 479.

Hus was preceded by John Milicius, a native of Moravia, a canon and preacher in Prague. He contended for the communion in both kinds, was a popular preacher, and a man of an auſtere life. He died in A. D. 1374, and left ſermons and other works. *L'Enfant's Baſle*, p. 14.

In this ſtate of things the minds of great numbers would be well prepared for the preaching of ſuch a man as John Hus. In A. D. 1408 and 1409 he diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo much by his declamation againſt the two popes, who then divided the obedience of the Chriſtian world, and againſt the church of Rome itſelf, that the archbiſhop of Prague declared him a ſchiſmatic, and forbad his preaching. He alſo ordered all the books of Wickliffe to be burned. But Hus having now acquired a great ſhare of popularity, being rector of the univerſity, and having got much credit by aſſerting the privileges of native Bohemians in it againſt the Germans, he paid no regard to the ſentence of the archbiſhop, or to the bulls of pope Alexander V, which had been procured to ſupport them.

The followers of Hus continually increaſing, the affair was carried before John XXIII, who had ſucceeded Alexander; and he ſummoned Hus to appear before him at Bologna; but being ſupported by the queen, by the king himſelf, and by the univerſity, he excuſed himſelf. He, however, ſent three perſons to appear for him; and the king, by whoſe interpoſition Hus had made his peace with the archbiſhop, requeſted that the pope would content himſelf with ſending legates into his country to correct any abuſes they might find there; ſufficiently intimating that there were none. Hus,

however,

however, not appearing in perſon, according to the citation, was declared to be contumacious, and as ſuch was excommunicated by the cardinal Colonna, to whom had been committed the cogniſance of the affair. An appeal being made from the ſentence of the cardinal, the pope again ſummoned him to appear before himſelf, and appointed four commiſſaries to hear the cauſe.

It does not appear that Hus paid any regard to theſe meaſures of the pope. For in the beginning of the year A. D. 1411, he not only excommunicated him, but laid the city of Prague under an interdict, while he ſhould be in it, excepting one particular church. This being the cauſe of much diſſention and even ſome bloodſhed in the city, Hus retired from it to Huſſinetz, the place of his nativity, and there publiſhed an appeal from the ſentence of the pope to the holy trinity. At the ſame time he addreſſed himſelf to the cardinals, propoſing to give an account of his faith before the members of the univerſity, and all the clergy, and ſaid he would ſubmit to their ſentence, tho', in conſequence of it, he ſhould be condemned to the flames. In this abſence from Prague he preached in ſeveral towns and villages, followed by great crouds of people, and then he publiſhed a treatiſe to ſhew that the books of heretics ought not to be burned.

John

John XXIII having publiſhed ſome violent bulls againſt Ladiſlas, Hus, who had returned to Prague, took the opportunity to declaim againſt his conduct, as exciting Chriſtians to ſhed the blood of one another, and alſo againſt indulgences, and cruſades in general, and challenged the doctors to diſpute with him on the power of the pope with reſpect to ſuch cruſades. On this a new champion on the part of Hus appeared, viz. Jerome of Prague. He was neither a clergyman, nor a monk, but having ſtudied in ſeveral of the moſt celebrated univerſities of Europe, and taken the degrees of bachelor and maſter in theology; he had been invited by the king of Poland to regulate the univerſity of Cracow. Thence he had gone into Hungary, where he was accuſed of hereſy; and going thence to Vienna, had been put in priſon, but was delivered at the requeſt of the univerſity of Prague. He now made a long harangue in ſupport of the theſis of Hus. By this time the friends of Hus being very numerous, and one provocation producing another, ſome of them inſulted thoſe who were preaching the papal indulgences; and on their calling the pope Antichriſt, three of them were apprehended by order of the ſenate, and beheaded in the night, their friends honouring them as martyrs.

The

The next year the pope publiſhed another bull againſt the errors of Wickliffe, and the Huſſites, ordering the books of the former to be burned, and citing Hus, and all his partiſans to appear at Rome in nine months. To this citation Hus paid no regard, but continued to declaim as violently as ever againſt the abuſes of the church of Rome. Two years after this, viz. in A. D. 1414, the pope iſſued another citation, but Hus replied, that the pope being only a prieſt like himſelf, he had no authority to judge him. On the other hand, he fixed up in his church of Bethlehem, a writing in which he accuſed the clergy of ſix errors, viz. 1. their aſſerting that in the celebration of the euchariſt they created their creator; 2. their believing in the virgin, the pope and the ſaints; 3. their pretending that whenever they pleaſe they can remit the puniſhment and the guilt of ſin; 4. that ſuperiors are to be obeyed whether their commands are juſt or unjuſt; 5. that every excommunication, juſt or unjuſt, binds the perſon excommunicated. The 6th related to ſimony.

The pope gaining nothing by theſe citations wrote to the king, to engage him to uſe every means in his power to extirpate the doctrine of Hus in his dominions; but this prince paid no more regard to this requiſition than Hus himſelf.

The

The council of Conſtance being now aſſembled, Hus was glad of the opportunity, which he flattered himſelf it would afford him, of juſtifying himſelf, and ſpreading his principles; but he formed a very wrong judgment of the ſpirit of that aſſembly, and the temper and power of his adverſaries. He had, however, the precaution to get a ſafe conduct from the emperor Sigiſmond, which ſhould have enſured his ſafety, both in going thither, during his ſtay, and till his return. Truſting to this, he ſet out for Conſtance with great confidence; publiſhing in all the places he went through, that he went to juſtify himſelf from the accuſations that had been brought againſt him. Winceſlas, for his greater ſecurity, ſent with him three Bohemian lords, and they arrived at Conſtance Nov. 3, A. D. 1414. But notwithſtanding his ſafe conduct, and the remonſtrance of the emperor, he was preſently after his arrival ordered to be taken into cuſtody, and eight articles of accuſation brought againſt him; 1. his having tought that the laity ought to communicate in both kinds; 2. that in the ſacrament of the altar the bread remains bread after conſecration; 3. that prieſts in a ſtate of mortal ſin cannot adminiſter the ſacraments, but that laymen in a ſtate of grace may do it; 4. that by the church is not to be underſtood the pope and the clergy; that the church cannot hold

hold temporal poſſeſſions, and that the lay lords may take them from it; 5. that Conſtantine and the other princes did wrong in endowing the church; 6. that all prieſts are equal in authority, and that ordinations, and caſes reſerved to the popes and the biſhops, are the effect of ambition; 7. that the church has not the power of the keys, when the pope, and the cardinals, and all the clergy are in a ſtate of mortal ſin. Laſtly, he was charged with deſpiſing excommunication, having always performed divine ſervice during his journey.

For his defence againſt theſe accuſations, he was not allowed to have any advocate, this being a privilege never granted to any perſon accuſed of hereſy. He was not, however, diſcouraged, and his mind was ſo much at eaſe, that during his confinement he compoſed ſeveral treatiſes. It was evidently with reluctance that the emperor abandoned him; but when the commiſſaries appointed to try Hus applied to him, he ſaid, that, as it was a caſe of *hereſy*, they were at full liberty, willing to have it ſuppoſed that, in this caſe, he had no power to give a ſafe conduct. But of this Hus ought to have been apprized in time, that if he had come, it might have been underſtood that it was at his own riſque. The Bohemian nobility ſaw the caſe in this light, and made earneſt remon-

monſtrances againſt his impriſonment; but the clergy having him now in their power, and having the conſent of the emperor, would hear no reaſon. He continued two months a priſoner with the Dominicans, and then was transferred to the Franciſcans.

In the fifth ſeſſion of the council, in which the decree of a council held in Rome, to puniſh all thoſe who did not burn the books of Wickliffe was confirmed, commiſſaries were named to judge in the affair of Hus; and they omitted nothing to induce him to retract his errors. But, tho' in priſon and ſick, he replied to all their charges, and till he had a public audience of the emperor, which he was made to believe he ſhould have, he was put into the cuſtody of the biſhop of Conſtance, by whoſe order he was confined in the fortreſs of Gotleben beyond the Rhine.

On the fifth of June A. D. 1415 he was examined before the council, after having been brought once more to the priſon of the Franciſcans, when he denied his having ever aſſerted that the ſubſtance of material bread remained in the conſecrated elements, or that he had maintained any of the errors of Wickliffe. He acknowledged, however, his having ſaid that he ought not to have been condemned unheard, and that he thought he was ſaved, and wiſhed that his ſoul might be with him;

him; and that he agreed with him in the opinion that Conſtantine had done wrong in giving eſtates to the church, and that tythe was alms, tho' the people were under obligation to pay them.

At his third audience his adverſaries, having carefully peruſed his writings, extracted from them thirty-nine heads of accuſation, among which were the following. "St. Peter neither was, nor is, the "head of the Catholic church. The papal dignities "came from the emperors. Wicked prieſts only "profane the ſacraments. No heretic ought to be "puniſhed corporally. The appeal to Jeſus Chriſt "makes the judgment of the pope and of the coun-"cil of no effect. Interdicts are unlawful. A prieſt "who lives according to the law of Chriſt ought to "preach, notwithſtanding any excommunication "whatever." After being long urged to confeſs his errors, and ſubmit to the council, in which the emperor joined his examiners, he perſiſted in defending himſelf, and was remanded to priſon.

On the 6th of July Hus, being produced before a full council, ſolemnly appealed to the tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt. This was imputed to him as a crime, and it was decreed that his books ſhould be burned, and himſelf degraded. While theſe ſentences were pronouncing, he was on his knees, denying the obſtinacy with which he was charged, and praying for his judges and accuſers. After

his degradation, by taking off, one by one, his ſacerdotal habits, he was declared to be a layman, and delivered over to the ſecular power, the conſequence of which was his being ordered to be burned alive. When they were conducting him to the place of execution, they led him by the place where his books were burning. But nothing they could do made any impreſſion on him. He kept reciting pſalms all the way to the ſtake; and to the laſt ſhewed the greateſt fortitude and piety. His enemies acknowledged that no philoſopher ſuffered death with ſo much firmneſs. After his death his aſhes were thrown into the river, to prevent their being collected, and preſerved as relicks, by his followers; but it is ſaid that in lieu of them, they ſcraped up the earth on which he had ſtood.

It does not appear that Hus denied any proper article of the Catholic faith, or that he recommended any of the writings of Wickliffe except thoſe in which he declaimed againſt the corruptions of the court of Rome. But he had made himſelf many and bitter enemies on ſeveral accounts. He was a ſtrenuous *Realiſt*, and zealous oppoſer of the *Nominaliſts*, who were numerous at Prague, and the virulence with which theſe two parties in the ſchools oppoſed each other had no bounds. And the council of Conſtance was very much governed by Gerſon, who was a Nominaliſt. Hus had alſo made himſelf

himſelf many enemies among the Germans, who had moſt influence in the council. by his conduct with reſpect to the univerſity of Prague. *Moſheim*, Vol. 3. p. 228. 230.

As Hus held the real preſence, and all the other doctrinal articles of the church of Rome, the true motives for his condemnation muſt have been his reſpect for the memory of Wickliffe, whom he perſiſted in maintaining to have been a holy man, and his vehement declamations againſt the corruptions of the court of Rome, and of the clergy in general. His ſentiments on this ſubject were not different from thoſe of many of the moſt reſpectable members of the council, but they had not addreſſed the common people on the ſubject, ſo as to endanger the tranquility of any ſtate, as Hus did.

The Flagellants were, in fact, more hoſtile to the church of Rome than Hus. They made no account of any of its ſacraments, they denied the real preſence and tranſubſtantiation; and with reſpect to eccleſiaſtical abuſes of all kinds they went beyond Wickliffe or Hus, beſides holding other opinions ſtill more offenſive, if what is generally ſaid of them by Catholic writers be true. But notwithſtanding this the council paſſed no cenſure upon them, but endeavoured to gain them by gentle meaſures, eſpecially by winning over Vincent Ferrier who favoured them, and whoſe preach-

ing was always attended by great crouds of them. In reality they probably conſidered them as a ſet of furious fanatics, who would only be driven to greater exceſſes by ſeverity. They, therefore, wiſely left the evil to cure itſelf. But this was not ſo likely to anſwer with the Huſſites, whoſe proceedings were more calm and rational, and therefore more likely to produce ſerious and permanent effects. *L'Enfant's Conſtance*, Vol. 2. p. 90.

The news of the execution of Hus excited the greateſt diſturbance in Prague, where his diſciples honoured him as a martyr. The lords of Bohemia and Moravia, to the number of ſixty, wrote to the council, complaining of their conduct in condemning Hus as a heretic, without proving him to have been one; and giving him the greateſt encomium, as a faithful miniſter of the goſpel, irreproachable in his doctrine, and morals. It had been well if the friends of Hus had only acted in this manner. But without conſidering the genuine ſpirit of Chriſtianity, or following the doctrine and example of their maſter, they aſſembled in arms, and not only plundered the houſes of the archbiſhop, and the clergy, but put ſeveral perſons to death. Not ſtopping here, and expecting that force would be employed againſt them, they formed themſelves into a regular army, and gave the command to John de Troxnow, commonly known by the name

of

of Ziſca, which ſignifies *one eyed*, he having loſt the other in a battle, in the wars of the king of Poland againſt the Teutonic knights; and who was at that time chamberlain to Winceslas. But the events of this unchriſtian and deſtructive war will be related in the next period of this hiſtory. I return to the account of Jerome of Prague.

Jerome went to Conſtance out of zeal to comfort and ſerve his friend Hus, and arrived there April 4th, A. D. 1415; but perceiving, by the ſituation in which he found things, that he could not ſerve him, and might endanger himſelf; and finding that he would not be allowed a public audience before the council, he fled to Uberlingen, whence he wrote to the emperor, and the lords of Bohemia, for a ſafe conduct; which, after ſome delay, was granted, but artfully drawn, as it promiſed him ſafety in going to the council, but expreſſed nothing about his return. Having, however, no ſuſpicion of artifice, he returned, and fixed a writing to all the churches and monaſteries in Conſtance; ſignifying his readineſs to attend the council, in order to give an account of his faith, and even undergo the puniſhment of hereſy if he could be proved to be a heretic. No attention being paid to what he had done, he ſet out on his

return to Bohemia, but was arreſted on the road, and conducted to Conſtance, as a priſoner.

Being examined with reſpect to his flight, and his opinions, he anſwered with great modeſty and firmneſs; and ſome of the examiners mentioning the puniſhment of fire, he ſaid he ſubmitted to the will of God, if that was their pleaſure. Being remanded to priſon, he fell ſick, and being overlooked he continued in priſon till May the year following; and in that interval Hus was executed. The members of the council hearing of the diſturbance occaſioned by their proceedings with reſpect to him, took great pains to induce him to recant, and at length they ſucceeded. In the preſence of the council, he read a form of recantation that was drawn up for him, in which he condemned the errors of Wickliffe and Hus, and declared his belief of the Catholic faith, on the ſubjects of the power of the keys, the ſacraments, indulgences, relicks &c. &c. but notwithſtanding this, he was ſtill detained a priſoner, the ſincerity of his recantation being ſuſpected, and there being a diſpoſition in the majority to find him a heretic, and puniſh him as ſuch, after they had diſgraced him.

Whether he was fully apprized of this or not, does not appear. However, repenting of what he had done, he requeſted a public hearing, with a view, as he ſaid, to explain his ſentiments; and

it

it was granted; after being warned that if he perſiſted in his errors, he would be treated with the greateſt rigour. To this he made no objection; and being permitted to ſpeak, he began with complaining of the injuſtice of his judges, and paſſed to an high encomium on Hus; ſaying that he came to Conſtance to ſupport him, that he gloried in holding his ſentiments, and that nothing but the fear of death had been his motive for retracting them. This retractation he revoked, as the greateſt crime with which his conſcience was burdened. He declared his approbation of the doctrines of Wickliffe and Hus, excepting what Wickliffe had advanced concerning the euchariſt, and his reſolution to adhere to this profeſſion as long as he ſhould live. This was the 26th of May.

Being remanded to priſon, he was, on the 30th of the ſame month, brought again before the council, and being reproached for his conduct, he replied with the greateſt firmneſs, and preſence of mind to every thing that was advanced againſt him; and perſiſting in his refuſal to retract his opinions, ſentence was pronounced againſt him as a heretic relapſed, and he was delivered to the ſecular power. Two days, however, being allowed him to prepare for death, endeavours were again uſed to induce him to recant, but to no purpoſe. He

heard the repetition of his ſentence with a chearful countenance; and as he went to the place of execution, recited the apoſtles creed, the litany, and a hymn to the virgin Mary. When he ſaw the wood that was prepared for his execution, he again repeated the creed, and ſuffered with the greateſt fortitude. His aſhes were carefully gathered up, and, like thoſe of Hus, thrown into the river.

SECTION XII.

Of various Opinions, theological and moral, that were the Subject of Diſcaſſion in this Period.

THIS period, as well as the preceding, produced much and ſubtle ſpeculation, and conſequently controverſy; but the great dread of hereſy ſerved to keep it within bounds, and prevented diſcuſſions of the greateſt conſequence within the precincts of the Catholic church. Some of the queſtions that were then ſtarted are curious, and deſerving the notice of theologians and moraliſts, who attend to the progreſs of the human intellect.

One of the moſt intereſting diſcuſſions within the bounds of the Catholic church in this period was

was that which was excited by pope John XXIII, who was well verſed in the theology of the times. Being a man of reading and learning, he leaned to the opinion of the antient Chriſtians concerning *the ſtate of the death*, which was loſt in the ſuperſtition of later times. Notwithſtanding the general opinion of the exiſtence of a ſoul diſtinct from the body, it was not thought, during many centuries after the Chriſtian æra, that the ſouls of the moſt virtuous went to heaven, to be with God and Chriſt, till after their union with their bodies at the reſurrection. An exception, however, was firſt made in favour of the ſouls of martyrs, which were thought to be intitled to peculiar privileges. Without this they could never have become the objects of prayer; and originally prayer was made *for* the dead, and not *to* them. At length, however, it came to be the univerſal opinion, that the ſouls of all good men went immediately to heaven after death.

This doctrine, now univerſally received, was called in queſtion by this pope. In a ſermon which he preached in A. D. 1331, he ſaid, that the ſaints will not enjoy the perfect viſion of God till after the reſurrection; that till that time they were "under the altar of God, under the protection "and conſolation of the humanity of Chriſt." This gave great offence to many; and his enemies

among the Franciſcans were eager to put this doctrine in the number of hereſies. So bold and extraordinary was his doctrine thought to be, that his friends ſaid, it was only advanced by him as an opinion to be diſcuſſed, and not as a certain truth; and no public notice was taken of it for two years; tho', probably, in order to gain favour with the pope, ſome of the cardinals profeſſed to think as he did on the ſubject.

A queſtion ſtarted by a pope was not likely to paſs long without notice; and in the year A. D. 1333 an Engliſh Dominican, having preached againſt the pope's doctrine, was by his order put in priſon. Notwithſtanding this, it was generally cenſured by the univerſity of Paris, which was the great ſchool of theology in theſe times. The unpopularity of his doctrine in a place of ſo much conſequence gave the pope no ſmall alarm; and in order to counteract the oppoſers of his doctrine there, he ſent two doctors of divinity to Paris, one a Franciſcan, and the other a Dominican, tho' on another pretence. But when one of them delivered a ſermon in defence of it before many of the ſtudents, his labours were very ill received. Such an error, it was ſaid, ought not to paſs without puniſhment. The king being not a little diſturbed at it, the pope wrote to him, to ſay that what he had advanced was only to promote the diſcuſſion

of

of a queſtion concerning which different Fathers had held different opinions, but that the church had not decided any thing about it.

This, however, was not ſufficient to ſatisfy the king. He aſſembled his doctors of theology at Paris, and they, in writing, gave an opinion directly againſt that of the pope; which giving him ſtill greater alarm, he aſſembled the cardinals in January A. D. 1335, and after reading to them various paſſages of writers for and againſt the opinion, he declared that, if any thing that he had advanced was contrary to the ſcriptures, or the Catholic faith, it was not his intention, and he expreſsly revoked it.

The king was not ſatisfied with this. He told the Franciſcan who had preached at Paris, that he was a heretic; and if he did not retract what he had advanced, he would have him puniſhed as a Patarin; ſaying, he would not ſuffer hereſy in his kingdom; and that if the pope himſelf ſhould maintain that opinion, he would condemn him in the ſame manner; adding that, tho' a ſimple layman, he was a good Chriſtian; that it was in vain to pray to the ſaints, or hope for ſalvation from their merits, if they did not ſee the divinity till the day of judgment; that, in this caſe, all indulgences granted by the church were vain, and conſequently that it overturned the Catholic faith.

Both

Both the king of France and Robert of Naples wrote to the pope on this occaſion, repreſenting to him, that tho' he had moved the queſtion only with a view to diſcover the truth, he had done more than became him as pope. It was enough for him to decide queſtions when they aroſe. The extreme unpopularity of the pope's opinion gave the king of France ſuch an aſcendency over him, that from this time he durſt not refuſe him any thing. And juſt before he died he aſſembled the cardinals, and declared to them, that he believed that ſouls ſeparated from the body, and purified, are in heaven in paradice, with Jeſus Chriſt, and in the company of the angels, and that they ſee God and the divine eſſence face to face, as much as is conſiſtent with the ſtate of a ſeparate ſoul; and that if he had ever ſaid or preached otherwiſe, he retracted it. That he really changed his opinion in conſequence of the oppoſition it had met with is not probable, and the laſt clauſe of his declaration rendered his retractation of no force.

His ſucceſſor Benedict had it much at heart to determine authoritatively the queſtion about the beatific viſion, which had been propoſed by John. He took the pains to compoſe a treatiſe on the ſubject, retiring from Avignon that he might have more leiſure for the purpoſe. This he read in a conſiſtory, to which he ſummoned all thoſe who held

held the opinion of John, but he could not expect any oppoſition on ſuch an occaſion as that. This work of Benedict's is ſtill preſerved at Rome. After this preliminary he the next year publiſhed a bull, in which it was declared, "that the ſouls of all "the ſaints, when they are purified, even before the "reſurrection, go to paradice, and ſee the divine "eſſence with an intuitive viſion face to face, without the interpoſition of any creature; and that the "ſouls of thoſe who die in mortal ſin go immediately to hell, and are tormented there."

The theologians of this age were generally great logicians and metaphyſicians, and their opinions on theſe ſubjects were ſometimes thought to border on hereſy; and when they attracted any conſiderable degree of public notice, it will be expected that an hiſtorian ſhould give information concerning them, however inſignificant they may be in themſelves.

At the council of Vienne in A. D. 1311 ſome opinions of Ubertin de Caſal, a great admirer of John de Oliva, and a perſon of much note among the ſpiritual Franciſcans, were thought to be of ſo much conſequence as to be publicly condemned in its decrees. He aſſerted, that the divine eſſence engenders and is engendered, which was an opinion of the abbot Joachim, condemned at the council of Lateran in A. D. 1215. He alſo maintained that

that the reaſonable ſoul is not the ſubſtantial form of the human body, which muſt have been thought to imply, that they had no proper connection. For, in conſequence of this, he was charged with believing that ſouls only can have merit or demerit. He likewiſe aſſerted that children at baptiſm receive the remiſſion of original ſin only, and not the graces and virtues.

In oppoſition to theſe tenets, it was now decreed, that "the Son of God ſubſiſted eternally "with the Father, in every thing by which the "Father exiſted, that he took the parts of our "nature united together, viz. a paſſible body and "a reaſonable ſoul, which is the ſubſtantial form "of the body." It was alſo decreed that "whoſoever ſhould dare to maintain that the reaſonable "ſoul is not the ſubſtantial form of the body, ought "to be conſidered as a heretic." Laſtly, it was "declared to be "the moſt probable opinion, "that graces and virtues are conferred at baptiſm, "to infants as well as to adults."

In A. D. 1329, John XXII condemned ſeveral extraordinary propoſitions of Eccard, a Dominican, among which were the following: "God "created the world as ſoon as he himſelf exiſted; "ſo that the world is eternal. Whatever God gave "to the Son in his human nature, he gives to us, "even union with himſelf, and ſanctification. What-

" Whatever the ſcriptures ſay of Jeſus Chriſt is " true of every good chriſtian. Whatever belongs " to the divine nature belongs to him. God is ſo " much *one*, that he is without any diſtinction, e- " ven of perſons." In what manner Siever Eccard might explain his aſſertions, he was held in great eſteem, as appears by the writings of John Thaulerus, another Dominician, and famous among the myſtical theologians, tho' what he ſays " concerning *tranſformation into God* reſembles " the refinements of the Beghards of this time, " and the Quietiſts in a later period.

We do not find in this period any controverſy of the leaſt importance concerning the perſon of Chriſt; but ſome opinions that bear ſome relation to the doctrines of the trinity and tranſubſtantiation, having engaged a great degree of attention at the time in which they were advanced, deſerve ſome notice of the hiſtorian, tho' not of the divine, at preſent.

In A. D. 1346, the doctors of Paris condemned the opinions of John de Merceur, a Ciſterian, ſome of which were the following. " Jeſus Chriſt " by his created will may will ſomething that will " never come to paſs. But in whatever manner " God wills, he wills efficaciouſly; ſo that it actu- " ally comes to paſs, even with reſpect to men, ſo " that no perſon runs otherwiſe than as God wills."

In

In A. D. 1351, Francis Baille, a Franciſcan, maintained that the blood of Chriſt ſhed in his paſſion was ſeparated from his divinity, and therefore was not to be adored with the worſhip of *latria*, during the three days in which he lay dead. A Dominican oppoſed him in this, and Clement VI, holding a ſolemn aſſembly on the occaſion, condemned the doctrine of the Franciſcan, and obliged him to make a public recantation of it.

In A. D. 1371, complaint was made to Gregory XI, of ſome Dominicans in Spain advancing in a ſermon, that if a conſecrated hoſt fell into the dirt, or was eaten by mice, &c. it became mere bread, the body of Chriſt leaving it, he forbad preaching on the ſubject, but did not decide the queſtion. Peter Lombard was alſo undecided on the ſubject, but Thomas Aquinas held that the body of Chriſt continues in the wafer in all events.

Some propoſitions advanced by John de Montſon, a Dominican of Catalonia, in A. D. 1307 had more ſerious conſequences. Being a doctor in theology he maintained in the ſchools, that "the hypoſtatical union in Jeſus Chriſt is "greater than the union of the three perſons in "the divine eſſence. There may be a mere crea-"ture more perfect with reſpect to merit than the "ſoul of Jeſus Chriſt. The virgin Mary was not "exempted from original ſin." Theſe, and ſe-

"veral

veral other propoſitions of leſs conſequence, were firſt condemned by the univerſity of Paris, and then by Clement VII, who excommunicated him for flying from his ſentence. One of his followers, William de Valon, biſhop of Evreux, after being obliged to retract his opinions, fled to Urban, and wrote a large treatiſe in defence of his right. This was the occaſion of a great perſecution of the Dominicans in France, eſpecially in the Northern parts of the kingdom. Many of them were impriſoned, no alms were given to them, and they were forbidden to preach, or to hear confeſſions. The univerſity baniſhed them intirely, and they became the laughing ſtock of the common people, who called them *Huets*. This continued many years. Thoſe who oppoſed them thought they did honour to the bleſſed virgin; ſo much had the opinion of her immaculate conception then gained ground.

Scholars in this period were much divided into the profeſſed followers of Thomas Aquinas, who was a Dominican, called *Thomiſts*, and thoſe of his rival John Duns Scotus, a Franciſcan, who were denominated *Scotiſts*. The points of difference between them related to the nature of the divine co-operation with the human will, the meaſure of grace neceſſary to ſalvation, the unity of form in man, or perſonal indentity, and other ſubtle

queſtions. But one of the principal differences between the Dominicans and the Franciſcans was that the latter defended the doctrine of the *immaculate conception of the virgin Mary*, which was oppoſed by the former. At the council of Conſtance in A. D. 1416 Gerſon propoſed that the controverſy concerning the immaculate conception of the virgin ſhould be decided by that aſſembly. He was not only an advocate for *this* doctrine, but alſo propoſed to inſtitute a feſtival in honour of the immaculate conception of her huſband Joſeph. *Fleury*, Vol. 21. p. 397.

In this age of nice diſtinctions and ſubtle diſputation, the doctrines of *grace and predeſtination* were the ſubjects of ſome diſcuſſions. In A. D. 1354 Gui, a hermit of St. Auſtin, and other perſons in France and England, were condemned for maintaining that "a man may ſo merit eternal "life, that God would be unjuſt in not giving it "to him; and that tho' there were no free will, "there might be ſin." In England ſome held that "the firſt man would have died, tho' he had "not ſinned, that original ſin does not make a man "guilty, and others of a ſimilar nature;" which ſhews the dawning of good ſenſe on theſe ſubjects.

At a council held at Canterbury in A. D. 1368, the following opinions, of the ſame general complexion, were alſo condemned. "Every man "ought

"ought to have the free choice of turning to God, "or from him, and according to this choice he will "be saved or damned. Baptism is not necessary "to the salvation of infants. No person will be "damned for original sin only. Grace, as it is "commonly explained, is an illusion, and eternal "life may be merited by the force of nature. "Nothing can be bad merely because it is forbid- "den. The fruit that Adam was forbidden to eat "was forbidden because it was in itself bad. Man "is necessarily mortal, Jesus Christ included, as "well as other animals. All the damned, even "the demons, may be restored, and become happy. "God cannot make a reasonable creature impec- "cable." It was an honour to the age, and the country, to produce such sentiments as these; but it was but a sudden blaze in the midst of much thick darkness, and, as far as appears, was soon extinguished.

In A. D. 1371 Albert, bishop of Halberstadt, taught that "every thing comes to pass necessarily, "according to the influence of the stars." As he was a doctor of the university of Paris, many per- sons, and especially of the nobility, adopted his opinion, and in consequence of it ceased praying either to God, or the saints. This was a sufficient call upon the pope to interfere, and he ordered the inquisitors to oblige him to retract his opinion,

and moreover to reprobate it in the moſt public manner.

In A. D. 1376 the writings of Raymond Lulli, not the Franciſcan of that name (who diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his writings, and more by dying in his attempt to convert the Mahometans of Barbary) but a Jew pretended to be converted, were cenſured by Gregory XI. He had advanced that "God may be denied in public, provided he be "confeſſed with the heart, and that the laws of "Mahomet were as good as thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt." *Abrigè Chronologique del. Hiſt. Eccles. in Ann.* The continuator of Fleury and Moſheim ſuppoſe this Raymond Lulli to have been the ſame with the Franciſcan.

The duke of Burgundy having aſſaſſinated the duke of Orleans in the reign of Charles VI of France, John Petit, a Franciſcan, publiſhed a treatiſe in which he defended his conduct, on the principle of its being lawful to kill a tyrant, even tho' an oath had been taken to the contrary. But the council of Conſtance, at the inſtance of Gerſon, without mentioning the writer, condemned the principle, as heretical, ſeditious, authorizing treaſon and perjury, and decreed that they who maintained it ſhould be conſidered as obſtinate heretics.

The

The Greek church was not without its ſhare of controverſy in this period, any more than the Latin, nor was the ſubject of more conſequence. Barlaam of Calabria returning from Avignon, had in A. D. 1343, a great diſpute with ſome monks of Mount Athos, at the head of whom was Gregory Palamas. They pretended that by intenſe acts of devotion they could, with corporeal eyes, ſee a divine light, and the ſame that had appeared to the apoſtles, on the mount of transfiguration; which light they maintained was the ſame with God himſelf. The Greek emperor not being able to reconcile the contending parties, a council was called at Conſtantinople in June A. D. 1344, in which the emperor himſelf preſided along with the patriarch John, when the doctrine of Palamas was condemned. Notwithſtanding this, the empreſs Ann, in order to mortify the patriarch, with whom ſhe was at variance, encouraged Palamas and his followers; in conſequence of which his doctrine ſpread, and occaſioned much diſturbance, the biſhops and clergy violently oppoſing them. She even procured the depoſition of the patriarch, and the biſhops being aſſembled on the occaſion, declared that Palamas had ſpoken like a good theologian. Iſidore, a friend of Palamas, being made patriarch, there was a ſchiſm in the church; the biſhops in general aſſembling, and excommunica-

ting him. Similar excommunications were thundered from other quarters, as Antioch, Alexandria, Trebiſond, Cyprus, Rhodes, and other places; and tho' Palamas himſelf was made biſhop of Theſſalonia, the people would not receive him, ſo that he retired to the iſle of Lemnos.

In A. D. 1351 the emperor Contacuzenus, who favoured Palamas, held a council, in which his doctrine of the light upon mount Tabor being uncreated was confirmed, and ſeveral perſons who were of the contrary opinion were depoſed, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of Nicephorus Gregoras, who wrote the hiſtory of it. To make this decree the more ſolemn, the emperor, moſt magnificently dreſſed, placed an account of it, drawn up by Palamas, with his own hand upon the altar, together with another writing, in anſwer to Barlaam and Acyndinus.

SECTION

SECTION XIII.

Miſcellaneous Articles.

1. *Of ſeveral Attempts to procure an Union of the Greek and Latin Churches.*

IN this period, as well as the preceding, there were attempts to procure an union between the rival churches of Rome and Conſtantinople, all ariſing from the ſame motive on the part of the Greeks, and all having the ſame end. The Greek emperors wanted the aid of the Latins againſt their powerful Mahometan enemies, but the clergy and people were utterly averſe to an union of the churches, and yet on no other terms could any aſſiſtance be procured from the Weſt. Beſides, after the taking of Conſtantinople by the Latins, the Greeks regarded them with tenfold abhorrence.

In A. D. 1339 Barlaam of Calabria, and Stephen Dandolo, a noble Venetian, came to Avignon with letters to the king of France, and Robert king of Naples; ſaying that they were ſent by Andronicus the Greek emperor to treat of an union between the two churches. He was at that time hard preſſed by the Turks; but ſo many difficulties aroſe with reſpect to the way in which it was to be brought about, that nothing was done.

Clement VI ſent ambaſſadors to Conſtantinople about the union of the two churches, when the Greek emperor propoſed that a general council ſhould be called for the purpoſe; but the death of this pope put a ſtop to all farther proceeding about it.

In A. D. 1355 John Paleologus, preſſed by the Turks and rebellious Greeks, expreſſed a great deſire of the union; and for this purpoſe he wrote to Innocent VI, ſwearing by the holy goſpels, that he would be faithful to him as the ſovereign pontiff, and receive his legates with all reverence; and that he would do his utmoſt to reduce all his ſubjects to his obedience. He, moreover, promiſed to ſend him his ſon, that he ſhould be taught the Latin tongue, and that the moſt diſtinguiſhed of the Greeks ſhould be inſtructed in the ſame language. He further declared, that if he did not accompliſh the union, he would reſign the empire to his ſon, and transfer to the pope his paternal power over him; ſo that he might govern in his name, give him a wife, tutors, and curators, and thus have the diſpoſal of the whole empire. But the pope not being able to give the emperor the aſſiſtance he wanted, nothing came of the negotiation. Nuncios, however, were ſent by the pope to Conſtantinople, and they were received by the emperor with all reſpect, and he received

the

the communion at their hands; but he informed the pope that, on account of the oppoſition of his ſubjects, he could not immediately execute what he intended. In A. D. 1369 the emperor, after ſending a reſpectful embaſſy in his own name, and that of many princes and clergy who favoured the union, went himſelf to wait on Urban V at Rome, when he made a public profeſſion of the Catholic faith, and kiſſed the pope's feet. But nothing more was done.

In A. D. 1400 the emperor Manuel went in perſon to France in order to procure aſſiſtance againſt Tamerlane, and one plea for ſuch ſuccour was the opportunity it might afford of putting an end to the difference between the two churches. But the ſtates of Europe being at that time divided by the great ſchiſm, no aſſiſtance could be given. However, a number of learned men accompanying the emperor, this journey is ſaid to have been a means of promoting a taſte for literature in the Weſt. *L'Enfant's Piſe*, Vol. 1. p. 127.

Laſtly, at the council of Conſtance in A. D. 1418, a ſolemn embaſſy was ſent by Manuel Paleologus, with propoſals for an union of the two churches, and it was received with much reſpect; but it does not appear that any thing was done in conſequence of it.

The conduct of the popes, whenever they had power in the East, was by no means such as would recommend the supremacy they claimed; discovering the greatest intollerance, and love of wealth and power. Gregory XI prevented as much as he possibly could, the exercise of the Greek religion in Candia, which was in the power of the Venetians. In one of the letters, written in A. D. 1373, he says, "At present that ecclesiastical censures "are better executed with the help of the secular "arm, we hope to extirpate schism in that island." He therefore directed that no clergyman should receive holy orders except from Latins, and that no Greek, priest or monk, should hear confessions, or preach to the people.

For some time the popes had a better prospect of success with the Armenians than with the Greeks. In A. D. 1346, these people wanting the assistance of the christians in the West, against the Turks, called a council, and condemned all the errors which Clement VI informed them they held, and promised to conform in all respects to the church of Rome; and for this purpose the pope sent two nuncios into the country. But no assistance being procured, the Armenians continued as far removed from the church of Rome as the Greeks.

2. Ar-

2. *Articles relating to Church Discipline.*

We find some new festivals introduced into the church in this period, as well as the preceding. John XXII introduced the festival of the *holy trinity*, which had been celebrated in some cathedrals and monasteries an hundred years before, but without uniformity; some observing it at one time, an others at another. In A. D. 1373, the festival of the *presentation of Christ in the temple* was brought from the East into the Western churches, with the permission of the pope.

Some festivals were confined to particular countries. In A. D. 1353 Innocent VI, at the request of the emperor Charles IV, instituted a festival in honor of the *sacred lance and nails*, which had been the instrument of our saviour's passion, in consequence of the great devotion that had been paid to them in Germany and Bohemia. In those countries it was appointed to be celebrated every two years, and an office was to be composed for it by such prelates as the emperor should chuse. The pope also granted an indulgence of three years and three quarters to those who should visit the church in which those relicks were preserved, one of an hundred hours for the mass, and for each hour of the office.

But

But the moſt important of the new feſtivals introduced in this period was that of the *Jubilee* at Rome. In A. D. 1299, a report, the origin of which has not been traced, prevailed in that city, that all the inhabitants who ſhould viſit the church of St. Peter the following year, would gain a plenary indulgence for all their ſins, and that every century it would have the ſame virtue; and accordingly, on the firſt day of January in A. D. 1300, eſpecially in the evening, and till midnight, there was a prodigious concourſe of people to viſit that church, it being then imagined that the indulgence would end that day. Others, however, continued to perform their devotions at that church for two months following. The pope obſerving this, after conſulting with the cardinals, iſſued a bull, in which he granted a plenary indulgence to all perſons who ſhould viſit the churches of St. Peter and Paul at Rome during the firſt year of that, and every ſucceeding century; but it was not at that time called a *jubilee*, or ſaid to be in imitation of the Jewiſh law. In conſequence of this, ſo great was the concourſe of people from all parts of the Chriſtian world, that John Villani, who was preſent, ſays that there were always in Rome not fewer than two hundred thouſand pilgrims, beſides reckoning thoſe who were at the ſame time continually going and returning; and yet that there was no want of pro-

proviſions for man or horſe, and that the people of Rome were great gainers by it.

At the requeſt of the people of Rome, who had found the benefit of this new popular inſtitution, Clement VI reduced the jubilee from an hundred to fifty years, and he firſt introduced this term; obſerving that Chriſt came to fulfil the Jewiſh law in a ſpiritual manner. Accordingly in the year A. D. 1350, the concourſe of people at Rome was prodigious, and tho' it began at Chriſtmas, when the cold was extreme, neither the ſnow nor the broken roads were any impediment to the pilgrims; and as neither the inns nor the houſes were ſufficient to contain them, many perſons made fires, and ſlept in the open air. It was ſuppoſed that there were never fewer than a million or twelve hundred thouſand perſons in Rome at the ſame time, from Chriſtmas to Eaſter, and at Whitſuntide more than eight hundred thouſand, and that the ſmalleſt number was two hundred thouſand. For the conſolation of the pilgrims, the holy handkerchief was exhibited every ſunday, and on all the great feſtivals; and on theſe occaſions the crouds were ſo great, that many perſons were cruſhed to death. At the end of the year the number of pilgrims increaſed, and then came the great lords and ladies from Italy and other countries. All the people of Rome were innkepers on this

occaſion, and by preventing the arrival of ſupplies rom ab road, ſold every thing exceſſively dear.

In A. D. 1389 Urban VI reduced the jubilee from fifty years to thirty-three, on the idea of Chriſt having lived that number of years on earth, and accordingly he appointed the year following, A. D. 1390, for the celebration of it; and then there was a great concourſe of pilgrims, but only from the countries in the obedience of Boniface, the ſucceſſor of Urban, and who had confirmed what he had fixed with reſpect to it. Tho' the great preſents which on this occaſion were made to the churches in Rome came into the hands of the pope, not content with this, he ſent perſons into every province, to ſell indulgences to thoſe who did not go to Rome, at the price that the journey would have coſt. From ſome provinces he, by this means, drew more than two hundred thouſand florins in gold. Theſe indulgences, it was ſaid, would avail for the remiſſion of all ſins, without any other penance. Many of theſe diſtributers of indulgences having embezled the money they received, were puniſhed; ſome of them were torn in pieces by the populace, and ſome killed themſelves. There were alſo on this occaſion, many impoſtors, who pretended to have the papal authority, and who abſolved perſons of all crimes for ſmall ſums, and granted diſpenſations of every kind.

kind. In order to raiſe money, this pope alſo granted indulgences to thoſe who viſited the churches at Cologn, Magdeburgh, and other cities, which brought a great number of pilgrims to them. He granted ſo many of every kind, tho' none without money, that they became quite contemptible.

Notwithſtanding this reduction of the Jubilee a ſmaller number of years, the idea of its being for a century was ſo fixed, that when the year A. D. 1400 arrived, it was attended by great numbers, and even from France, tho' forbidden by the king, and tho' the pilgrims ſuffered much from the troops of the pope, who plundered them, and abuſed the women, ſome of noble families. The plague alſo was in Rome this year, and the pope durſt not leave it, leſt he ſhould by that means loſe the temporal ſovereignty of the city; and yet he contributed nothing from his treaſury for the relief of ſick ſtrangers.

There was no change in the mode of adminiſtering the ordinances of baptiſm or the Lord's ſupper by the Catholics in this period. It appears by the writings of William Durante, biſhop of Monde, who died in A. D. 1296, that baptiſm was performed by immerſion, and only at Eaſter and Whitſuntide, except in caſe of neceſſity. But

at

at the time of the benediction of a font, a few children were baptized.

The Lord's ſupper was adminiſtered to the laity in general, only in one kind, which took place gradually, and without any order of the pope or council, but on particular occaſions the cup was given to ſome laymen. Thus Clement VI gave a licence to the king of France, and alſo to Eudes duke of Burgundy, to communicate in both kinds; but recommended to them to do it with great precaution, that none of the precious blood might be ſpilled.

But communion in both kinds was ſo evidently the primitive cuſtom, that it contributed greatly to recommend the principles of the Waldenſes, who retained it. But in no country was more ſtreſs laid upon it than in Bohemia, at the time of the council of Conſtance. It was ſtrenuouſly inſiſted upon by one Jacobel, rector of the pariſh of St. Michael in Prague, who had been inſtructed by Peter of Dreſden, and expelled from Saxony, for the hereſy of the Waldenſes. He having eſtabliſhed this cuſtom in his own pariſh, the clergy got him expelled from that church; but he was received in another, where he taught the ſame doctrine. At length he was excommunicated by the archbiſhop of Prague; but as he paid no regard to that, the affair was brought before the council

pope then was, they endeavoured to make themſelves maſters of the place; but he took his meaſures ſo well, that many of them were killed, others taken, and hanged, and the reſt diſperſed. Theſe ſhepherds of France beſet a caſtle to which many Jews had retired, when, on the failure of weapons, they threw their children from the walls to excite compaſſion, but it had no effect. The beſiegers breaking down the gates, found only dead bodies, and a few children. The Jews had killed one another, that they might not fall into the hands of the Chriſtians. There remained only one perſon alive, and him they tore in pieces. The plague having ſeized theſe ſhepherds, they imputed it to the Jews, who they ſaid had poiſoned the wells; and the king, unable to protect them, on their refuſal to embrace Chriſtianity, delivered up fifteen thouſand, all of whom they burned alive. *Baſnage*, Vol. 9. p. 522. 526.

A Jew being falſely accuſed of murdering a Chriſtian in the reign of Charles VI of France, ſeveral of that nation were apprehended, and of theſe ſome were hanged, others were ſcourged, and the ſynagogue was condemned to pay eighteen hundred crowns. Two years after this all the Jews were baniſhed from France, and in a manner that made the event ſo calamitous that it became an

epocha in their hiſtory, and from it they dated ſubſequent events. *Baſnage*, Vol. 9. p. 605.

England was diſturbed and relieved in the ſame manner about the ſame time. On this occaſion the pope publiſhed a bull in favour of the Jews, tho' at the ſame time he condemned the Talmud, and ordered the copies of it to be burned.

In A. D. 1338 many Jews were murdered in Auſtria, on the pretence of their procuring conſecrated hoſts, and piercing them, ſo that blood came out of them. But it was found that ſome Chriſtians got wafers not conſecrated, and made them bloody, in order to throw an odium on the Jews. Theſe violences, however, extended thro' the whole of Upper Germany, where the peaſants aſſembled, and murdered all the Jews they could find, on pretence of zeal for Chriſtianity. But the emperor Lewis put a ſtop to theſe proceedings.

The great plague in A. D. 1348 being aſcribed to the Jews poiſoning the fountains, many of them were murdered without examination, and many mothers, fearing that their children would be baptized after their deaths, threw them into the fire along with themſelves, to be burned together with their huſbands. Theſe maſſacres were moſt frequent in Germany; but the pope prevented them at Avignon.

In

In A. D. 1340 there was an inſurrection of the people of Spain againſt the Jews of Toledo, whither R. Aſcher, who had fled from his native country Nothenberg, had taken refuge with his eight ſons. One of theſe, ſeeing the Chriſtians burſting into the houſe, killed all his relations who were there with him, his own wife, and that of his brother Jacob, and then himſelf. This Jacob tho' poor was a learned man, and was of the moſt generous diſpoſition. He had taught *gratis*, and left behind him a work on civil and eccleſiaſtical law. *Baſnage*, Vol. 9. p. 530.

In A. D. 1390, under Henry III of Caſtile, Martin archdeacon of Aſtigy preaching in the ſtreets of Seville and Cordova, raiſed a violent perſecution againſt the Jews, and procured them to be maſſacred in that city. The ſame fate purſued them to Toledo, Valentia, and Barcelona, where ſome were plundered, and others killed, tho' ſome renounced their religion to ſave their lives. The ſynagogues of Seville and Cordova which had been numerouſly attended were deſtroyed. Thoſe who fled to Andaluſia and other places were killed by the inhabitants. His ſon John was not more humane than his father. Thoſe who were concealed in the former reign periſhed miſerably in the latter. *Ibid.* Vol. 9. p. 537. Nor were the Jews more at their eaſe in Arragon. *Ib.*

After ſome time the Jews met with better treatment, and in A. D. 1412, many of them were converted by Vincent Ferrier, a Dominican, and among them Joſhua Horlaki, phyſician to Benedict XIII, who, being baptized, took the name of *Jerome of the holy faith.* After his converſion he compoſed two treatiſes againſt the Jews, one on the method of convincing them, and the other againſt the Talmud. In the firſt he ſhewed that the twenty-four conditions which they require in the Meſſiah were found in Jeſus. He was anſwered by Iſaac Nathan, and ſeveral others.

There were ſeveral public conferences with the Jews in the preſence of Benedict XIII at Tortoſa in Spain, when the principal of the diſputants on the part of the Chriſtians was Jerom. In conſequence of theſe conferences and the preaching of Vincent Ferrier, * it was ſaid that great numbers of

* Vincent Ferrier preached with great applauſe thirty years in Spain, France, and Italy, and more miracles are aſcribed to him than to Moſes or Jeſus Chriſt. He is ſaid to have converted thirty thouſand Mahometans, beſides Jews, Waldenſes, and other heretics; and what is more, to have reclaimed a hundred thouſand from a profligate life. He is, however, ſaid to have thought too well of the Flagellants, who followed him with much applauſe. This appears from a letter that

of Jews were converted; but relapſing to their former faith, it ſerved as a pretext for the pope to perſecute them. In the bulls that he publiſhed on this occaſion he ordered the inquiſition to proceed againſt any perſons who ſhould keep any of their books; and he ordered all princes to exclude Jews from the benefit of the laws in the adminiſtration of juſtice. He forbad all communication or converſation with Jews; and directed that they ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from Chriſtians by opprobrious badges, and not allowed to follow any trade, or lend money on uſury; and laſtly, that they ſhould become Chriſtians, or be impriſoned for life. A particular account of each of theſe conferences is given by a Jewiſh writer; and according to him thoſe of his religion had the advantage in the argument. This account may be ſeen in *L'Enfant's Hiſtory of the council of Piſa*, Vol. 2. p. 153. &c.

In order to promote the converſion of unbelievers in general, and the Jews among the reſt, it was ordered at the council of Vienne in A. D. 1312, that there ſhould be maſters to teach Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldee in the court of Rome, and

that Gerſon wrote to him from the council of Conſtance, whither he wiſhed to draw him. After the election of Martin V he deſerted Benedict. He died at Vannes in Britanny in A. D. 1419, and was afterwards canonized. *L'Enfant's Piſe*, Vol. 2. p. 138.

in the univerſities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca, two for each.

6. *Of the Cruſades.*

Tho' there was no general expedition actually entered upon for the recovery of the holy land in this period, it did not immediately ceaſe to be a conſiderable object with the Chriſtian powers. The taking of Rhodes by the knights of St. John encouraged ſome to make the attempt; and at the council of Vienne in A. D. 1312, Henry king of the Romans, Philip king of France, Lewis of Navarre, and Edward II of England, promiſed to undertake the expedition; and in conſequence of this a general cruſade was ordered to be publiſhed, and a levy was made of the tenth of eccleſiaſtical revenues for ſix years.

John XXII was a zealous promoter of another cruſade; and in his time Philip, king of France, actually took the croſs, as chief of the expedition; being allowed the tenth of all the church livings in his kingdom for the purpoſe; and in A. D. 1353, the cruſade was preached thro' all France, the troops being appointed to embark in three years.

In A. D. 1365 an attempt was actually made to recover the holy land by another deſcent upon Egypt. After great efforts on the part of pope Urban V, Peter de Luſignan, king of Cyprus, failed

failed with an army of ten thouſand foot and fourteen hundred horſe; and after a ſolemn benediction given by the legate, they landed near Alexandria, and took the place. But finding their numbers were not ſufficient to keep poſſeſſion of it, they plundered, and then abandoned it. This unſucceſsful attempt was of great diſſervice to the Chriſtian cauſe, as it excited the ſultan of Egypt to engage the aſſiſtance of the Turks, in order to get poſſeſſion of Cyprus and Rhodes, from which iſlands the Chriſtian powers had failed to attack him.

7. *Of the Increaſe of Infidelity.*

Infidelity appears to have made great progreſs in this period, in conſequence of the writings of Averroes in the preceding. An enthuſiaſtic admiration of his writings and thoſe of Ariſtotle, on which he wrote commentaries, and which were quoted as oracles in the ſchools of philoſophy, occaſioned a great contempt for the books of ſcripture, and the writings of the Chriſtian Fathers, eſpecially in the principal cities of Italy, where learning was moſt cultivated. Of this Melchior Canus, biſhop of the Canaries, made heavy complaints.

Petrarch was exceedingly ſhocked at the affrontery of thoſe unbelievers whom he met with at

Venice. They made no account of Jesus Christ or the apostles, despising them as unlettered men; and their doctrines they treated as fables. They respected no persons as men of sense, and philosophers, but those who ridiculed them; and they considered those who defended them as mere fools. One of them meeting with Petrarch in a bookseller's shop, after expressing great contempt for the apostles and the Christian Fathers, said that if he could but read Averroes, he would see how superior he was to those simpletons. (nugatoribus.)

Peter D'Apono, a famous professor of medicine and astronomy at Padua in the time of Petrarch, and who, in A. D. 1310, had written a commentary on the problems of Aristotle, was one of the heads of these unbelievers. He ridiculed the miracles of Christ, and especially that of the resurrection of Lazarus. He was, however, sentenced by the inquisition to be burned; but it was only executed in effigy after his death.

Petrarch hearing so much in praise of the writings of Averroes, had the curiosity to read them; and he was so much shocked that he formed a design of answering them. But his age and various occupations preventing him, he endeavoured to persuade Lewis Marsigli, a monk of the order of St. Austins at Florence, to undertake it, and to dedicate his work to him; being probably ignorant, as

the

the writer of his memoirs says, that Thomas Aquinas, and after him several others, had combated the opinion of the unity of intellect, and that R. Lulli in particular had solicited Clement V to condemn the errors of Averroes.

At Padua Averroism made such progress, that Urban of Bologna, prior of the Servites, who had been professor of theology at Paris and Bologna as well as at Padua, was called *the Averroist*, on account of his great attachment to this writer, on whom he wrote commentaries. In a later period Nicolet Vernios, one of the professors at Padua, published a treatise in which the doctrine of Averroes was represented in so pleasing a light, that it was said he drew almost all Italy into his opinions. At length the magnitude of the evil induced Leo X, in a later period still, to endeavour to stop the progress of it, by a bull published at the council of Lateran, in which he forbad, under heavy penalties, the teaching that "the soul of man is "mortal, or that there is but one soul," or principle of intellect, "in all men."

These philosophers did not attack Christianity openly; and Petrarch says that when they discoursed in public, they always said that they spoke as philosophers, or not as theologians. By this conduct, and always professing their belief of the

doctrines of the Catholic church, they escaped persecution.

This contempt for revealed religion affected even the learned Mahometans, and one of their writers reproached the Caliph Almamon, who introduced the works of Aristotle among them; saying the Arabs despised the Koran after they had read Aristotle. Averroes said that Judaism was the religion of children, and Mahometanism that of hogs; but that no religion was so absurd as that of the Christians, who worshipped what they ate. *Memoirs de Petrarch*, Vol. 3. p. 750. &c. So ready were unbelievers then, as well as now, to take advantage of the corruptions of Christianity to decry the whole scheme. Of how great importance, then, is it to detect and expose those corruptions. We are much obliged to unbelievers for their assistance in this useful work.

8. I shall close this period with the mention of an article of some curiosity.

In A. D. 1300 pope Boniface VII forbad the custom of boiling the dead bodies of princes, and other persons of distinction, in order to separate their bones, and convey them to distant places; a method which, it has been observed, was used with respect to the body of Lewis. This custom

the

the pope reprobated as barbarous, and forbad it under pain of excommunication, to thoſe who ſhould practice it, and the deprivation of Chriſtian burial to thoſe on whom it was practiced. *Fleury*, Vol. 19. p. 44.

The End of the second Volume of the second Part, or the fourth of the whole Work.

BW901 .P94 v.4
A general history of the Christian
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00078 0785